

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8891 OF 2026

DATE : 29.06.2026

Between :

Katyada Bapurao

... Petitioner/Accused

And

The State of Telangana

... Respondent/Complainant

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 by the petitioner praying this Court to enlarge him on bail who is accused in Crime No.225 of 2026 on the file of Hon'ble I-Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate (Spl.Mobile) at Kamareddy. The offence alleged against the petitioner is under Section 309(4) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The facts of the case are that the de facto complainant lodged a complaint on 27.05.2026 stating that he is working as an AR Constable, and on 26.05.2026 at about 2:00 PM, while

proceeding on foot from Kalabhairava Swamy Temple, Gumasta Colony, towards the District Police Office, Kamareddy, an unknown person offered him lift in a white-coloured car. Believing him, the complainant boarded the vehicle. Near Haritha Vanam, the driver stopped the car, claimed that the petrol had been exhausted, and demanded money from the complainant. When questioned, the driver threatened him, slapped him, and forcibly snatched his purse containing about Rs.4,000/- cash and his ID card. Thereafter, he pushed the complainant out of the car and fled away. Though the complainant chased the vehicle for some distance, he could not apprehend the accused as the car had no number plate and was driven away at high speed. On the advice of his friends, the complainant reported the incident to the police on the following day. Based on the said complaint, the present Crime is registered against the accused for the above offences.

3. Heard Sri K.Sanjeev, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri D.Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He

contends that there is an unexplained delay of about 17 hours in lodging the complaint, despite the de facto complainant being an AR Constable who was well aware of the necessity of promptly reporting a cognizable offence. It is further submitted that at the relevant time of alleged incident, the petitioner was elsewhere, and his presence near a hotel at about 1:50 PM on 26.05.2026 is supported by CCTV footage. Learned counsel also submitted that the alleged occurrence is highly improbable, as it is stated to have taken place near the District Police Headquarters and Haritha Vanam, a public place, yet no independent witness has been examined; the complainant initially alleged involvement of an unknown person driving a vehicle without a registration number and that there is no material connecting the petitioner to the offence. It is also contended that the petitioner is a respectable, law-abiding citizen and a journalist with over 25 years of service, presently working as Editor of Prashna Ayudam newspaper, and has no criminal antecedents. Learned counsel further submits that no incriminating material has been recovered from the petitioner, his residence, or at his instance; neither the alleged stolen cash nor the ID card has been recovered. According to the remand case diary, only Rs.1,000/- was allegedly recovered, without any

explanation regarding its source. It is therefore contended that there is no direct or circumstantial evidence linking the petitioner to the alleged crime. He further submits that the petitioner has been in judicial custody from 27.05.2026, the investigation has substantially been completed and no further recovery is to be effected. As such, petitioner's custodial interrogation is not required anymore. Hence, prayed this Court to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed bail contending that allegation against the petitioner is serious in nature. He contended that during the course of investigation, the petitioner was identified as the person who committed the offence and material collected by the investigating agency prima facie establishes his involvement in the crime. He further submitted that, if petitioner is released on bail at this stage, he may influence witnesses and hamper the investigation. Hence, prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Having regard to the submissions made by both sides and upon perusal of the material available on record, petitioner has been in judicial custody since 27.05.2026 and the investigation

appears to have substantially progressed. Further the alleged stolen property has not been recovered from the petitioner. Considering the period of incarceration of petitioner in jail, facts and circumstances and the stage of investigation, this Court deems it fit to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the I-Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate (Spl. Mobile) at Kamareddy.
 - ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m and 5.00 p.m., on every Monday for a period of eight (8) weeks or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier, for the purpose of investigation, and thereafter, as and when required.
 - iii. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 483(2) of the BNSS.
7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date :29.06.2026
Rds

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8891 OF 2026

DATE : 29.06.2026

Rds