

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.8073 & 8061 of 2026

DATE: 12.06.2026

IN CrI.P.No. 8073 of 2026

BETWEEN:

MVR Santhosh Lakshmi Narsimha Rao.

.....petitioner/accused No.1

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
at Hyderabad & another.

.....Respondents

IN CrI.P.No. 8061 of 2026

BETWEEN:

PVS Prasad @ PSV Prasad.

.....petitioner/accused No.2

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
at Hyderabad& another.

.....Respondents

COMMON ORDER

These Criminal Petitions are filed praying this Court to enlarge the petitioners on bail who are arrayed as accused Nos.1 and 2 in Crime No.303 of 2026 before the Sanathnagar Police Station, Hyderabad.

2. The brief facts of the case are that respondent No.2/de facto complainant lodged a complaint alleging that she is a tenant in the subject premises belonging to the owner, represented by the petitioner, who is the Special Power of Attorney holder of the owner residing in the United States of America. It is alleged that, in connection with disputes relating to her occupation of the leased premises, the petitioner and another accused compelled her to vacate the premises, interrupted water and electricity supply, humiliated her by referring to her caste, and threatened her with dire consequences. Based on the said allegations, the police registered Crime No.303 of 2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 79 and 324(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Section 3(1)(r)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, and took up investigation.

3. Heard Sri K. Rajashekar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, as well as, Sri M. Ramachander Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent – State, and Sri Zakir Ali, learned counsel for respondent No.2.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that petitioners were falsely implicated and that the dispute is essentially civil in nature arising out of a long-standing landlord-tenant relationship. He contended that despite repeated eviction notices and a written undertaking, the de facto complainant failed to vacate the premises, and that the present complaint was lodged only after steps were initiated for eviction. It was further submitted that the essential ingredients of the offences under the SC/ST Act, as well as Sections 79 and 324(2) of BNS, are not made out and that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. Therefore, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, by allowing both the criminal petitions.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for petitioners, contending that the allegations in the complaint disclose

commission of cognizable offences, including offences under the SC/ST Act. It is contended that the investigation is at a nascent stage and that specific allegations have been made against the petitioner regarding intimidation and caste-based abuse. Therefore, considering the gravity of the allegations and the statutory provisions involved, the petitioner is not entitled to the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail and the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 submitted that petitioners had intentionally harassed and intimidated the de facto complainant with a view to forcibly evict her from the leased premises. He contended that specific allegations have been made regarding interruption of essential services, criminal intimidation, and caste-based humiliation attracting the provisions of the SC/ST Act. He further submitted that the investigation is still in progress and that the allegations disclose the commission of serious cognizable offences. Therefore, he prayed that the Criminal Petitions be dismissed.

7. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and a perusal of the material available on record, it is noted that there are admitted disputes between the parties

relating to the leased premises. The record shows that eviction notices were issued and certain undertakings were executed by the de facto complainant. Whether the allegations in the complaint are true or not is a matter for investigation. At this stage, considering the nature of the dispute, the facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not necessary, this Court deems it fit to grant bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioners shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Banjara Hills Police Station within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release him on bail on executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/-, with two sureties, for the like sum each.
- ii. The petitioners shall abide by the other conditions stipulated in Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and co-operate with the Investigating Officer in investigating the case.

iii. The petitioners shall appear before the concerned Investigating Officer on every Monday between 09:00 a.m, and 05:00 p.m., for a period of eight weeks or till the filing of the charge sheet, whichever is earlier, and thereafter, as and when required.

8. Accordingly, these Criminal petitions are allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 12.06.2026
PT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.8073 & 8061 of 2026

DATE: 12.06.2026

PT