IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

I.A. NOs: 2 to 4 OF 2026
IN/AND
CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 13017 OF 2025

Between:

G.Priyadarshini, d/o Dayanand, aged about 25 years, occ. Private Service, Caste. SC Mala r/o. Gandhinagar, Ramanthapur, Uppal, Medhal Malkajgiri District.

...PETITIONER/DEFACTO COMPLAINANT

AND

1. The State of Telangana, through S.H.O., Keesara Police Station, Rachakonda Commissionerate, Medchal Malkajgiri District, rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court, Hyderabad.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

2. Gajula Sandeep Kumar s/o Gajula Devadas aged about 32 years, occ. Employee r/o H.No. 6-26/1/A/3, Road No.2, Manasa Nagar, Suryapet.

...RESPONDENT/PETITIONER

Petition under Section 483(2) of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to cancel the orders passed in Crl. P. No. 11208 of 2025 dt. 8-9-2025 wherein the anticipatory bail is granted to the 2nd respondent.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026

Between:

AAA D/o BBB, aged about 26 years, occ. Software Engineer in Wipro, Financial District, Hyderabad-500032, T.G.

...PETITIONER/DEFACTO COMPLAINANT

AND

1. The State of Telangana, rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad.

...R-1/R-1/COMPLAINANT

2. Gajula Sandeep Kumar s/o Gajula Devadas aged about 32 years, occ. Employee R/o H.No. 6-26/1/A/3, Road No.2, Manasa Nagar, Suryapet, Telangana.

...R-2/R-2/ACCUSED-1

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to consider to accord permission to the petitioner/girl herein to submit additional grounds in the above CRLP No.13017 of 2025 through this Interlocutory Application, for better appreciation and appropriate adjudication of the above CRLP No.13017 of 2025, pending disposal of the above CRLP No.13017 of 2025.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to order for counseling between the accused-1/boy and the petitioner/girl in search of a permanent and an amicable solution to their dispute while they both firmly and very strongly decided to marry each other after which some sort of differences arose between them which were also non-serious in nature and for no justified reasons whatsoever, pending disposal of the above CRLP No.13017 of 2025, in the interest of justice as otherwise the Petitioner herein and also the Respondent-2/accused-1 and their both the families shall be put to irreparable loss besides justice shall be stultified.

I.A. NO: 4 OF 2026

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to order directing Respondent-2/Accused herein to stop going for marriage with any other girl, pending disposal of the above CrlP No.13017 of 2025 and also pending disposal of the FIR/Crime No.633 of 2025 on the fie of the Keesara PS, Malkajgiri Police Commissionerate, in the interest of justice as otherwise the Petitioner as well

as the Respondent-2/Accused-1 herein together with their families and another family too shall be put to irreparable loss besides justice shall be stultified.

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri B. Sree Rama Krishna, Advocate for the Petitioner, Sri M. Ramachander Reddy, Additional Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No. 1 and of Smt. Katta Sravya, Advocate for the Respondent No. 2.

The Court made the following: COMMON ORDER

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

I.A.Nos.2 to 4 of 2026

In/And

CRIMINAL PETITION No.13017 of 2025

DATE: 23.04.2026

BETWEEN:

G. Priyadarshini.

.....Petitioner/de facto complainant

And

The State of Telangana and another

.....Respondents

COMMON ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed seeking to cancel the bail granted to the respondent No.2 in Crl.P.No.11208 of 2025 dated 08.09.2025.

2. Heard Sri B. Sree Rama Krishna, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Sri M.

Ramachander Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.1 – State as well as Smt. Katta Sravya, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2/accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the anticipatory bail granted to the 2nd respondent in Crl.P.No.11208 of 2025 is unsustainable and liable to be cancelled and that the said bail was granted on an erroneous and inadequate ground, without considering the serious allegations attracting Section 69 of BNS, which criminalizes sexual intercourse obtained by deceit or false promise of marriage. He further submitted that the 2nd respondent is a habitual offender, having previously been involved in a similar offence, and there exists a strong likelihood of tampering with evidence and influencing witnesses. It is argued that continuation of anticipatory bail would adversely affect the investigation and trial, and therefore, the same warrants cancellation in the interest of justice. Hence, he prayed the Court to cancel the bail granted to the respondents by allowing this Criminal Petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner/de facto complainant submitted that I.A.Nos.2 to 4 of 2026 are filed to bring on record additional and material grounds which were inadvertently omitted earlier due to change of counsel, and for effective adjudication of the matter. He contended that the respondent induced the petitioner into a relationship on a false promise of marriage and subsequently betrayed her by getting engaged to another woman for monetary considerations, thereby attracting the offence under Section 69 of BNS, 2023. He further submitted that the dispute has elements of a family dispute involving closely related parties, and therefore this Court may consider directing counseling/mediation to arrive at an amicable resolution and to avoid multiplicity of proceedings.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the 2nd respondent submits that the anticipatory bail was rightly granted by this Court after considering the facts and circumstances of the case. She further submitted that the allegations are false and motivated, arising out of personal disputes, and that no offence under Section 69 of BNS is made out. She contended that the 2nd respondent has

complied with all conditions imposed by the Court and has not misused the liberty granted to him. She further contended that mere apprehensions of tampering with evidence are unfounded and that there are no supervening circumstances warranting cancellation of bail. Hence, she prayed the Court to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

6. Learned counsel for respondent No.2/accused submitted that the Interlocutory Applications are not maintainable and are filed only to introduce repetitive and unnecessary averments and that the relationship between the parties was consensual and the allegations of false promise of marriage are misconceived. She further argued that the reliefs sought, including counseling or directions affecting the respondent's personal decisions, are beyond the scope of the present proceedings. Hence, it is prayed that the Interlocutory Applications be dismissed.

7. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court has carefully considered the rival contentions. The learned counsel for the petitioner

strenuously contended that the respondent No.2 had induced the petitioner into a relationship on a false promise of marriage and subsequently betrayed her by getting engaged to another woman, and therefore sought cancellation of bail along with consideration of additional grounds and directions for counseling. On the other hand, the learned counsel for respondent No.2 contended that the relationship between the parties was consensual, that the allegations are exaggerated, and that the present petition is an attempt to re-agitate the matter without any new circumstances, and opposed both the main petition as well as the Interlocutory Applications.

8. Having considered the above submissions, this Court is of the view that the grounds urged by the petitioner do not disclose any supervening circumstances warranting cancellation of bail already granted by this Court. The allegations now sought to be emphasized were either available at the time of grant of bail or are in the nature of reiteration of earlier contentions. The reasons assigned by the petitioner are not sufficient to hold that the respondent No.2 has misused the liberty granted to him.

9. It is also a settled principle that cancellation of bail stands on a different footing from rejection of bail, and requires cogent material showing misuse of liberty, such as threatening witnesses, tampering with evidence, or non-cooperation with the investigation. In the present case, no such material is placed before this Court. There is no allegation that the respondent No.2 has violated any of the bail conditions or interfered with the course of investigation.

10. Further, this Court cannot sit in appeal or review over its earlier order granting bail, as review jurisdiction is not available in criminal matters, and the present petition, in effect, seeks reconsideration of the same grounds which is impermissible in law.

11. Insofar as the Interlocutory Applications are concerned, though it is contended that additional grounds were omitted earlier due to change of counsel, this Court finds that the said grounds do not materially alter the nature of the case. The prayer seeking counseling/mediation, though made in the backdrop of a personal dispute, cannot be granted in the present proceedings for cancellation of bail, as the scope of

the present petition is limited. Hence, the said Interlocutory Applications do not merit consideration.

12. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the Criminal Petition as well as the Interlocutory Applications, and the same are liable to be dismissed.

13. In view thereof, I.A.Nos.2 to 4 of 2026 and the Criminal petition are dismissed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

SD/- K.BHAVANI SWAMY
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The III Additional Junior Civil Judge-cum-III Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Kushaiguda
2. The Station House Officer, Keesara Police Station, Rachakonda.
3. Two CCs to Public Prosecutor, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT]
4. One CC to Sri B. Sree Rama, Advocate [OPUC]
5. One CC to Smt. Katta Sravya, Advocate [OPUC]
6. Two CD Copies

VH/KA

HIGH COURT

DATED: 23/04/2026

COMMON ORDER
I.A. NOs: 2 to 4 OF 2026
IN/AND
CRLP.No.13017 of 2025



DISMISSING THE

CRIMINAL PETITION

(9) NT
4/5/26.