IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.17019 OF 2026

(CNR No. HBHC010714952026)

DATE: 06.11.2026

Between :

Mohan Babu Azmeera

… Petitioner

AND

The State of Telangana

… Respondent

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nyaya Suraksha Sanhita*, 2023* (for short, 'BNSS'), seeking the relief of anticipatory bail.

2. The petitioner is arrayed as the sole accused in Crime No.129 of 2026 on the file of Paloncha Rural Police Station, Bhadradri Kothagudem District, facing accusations under Sections 26, 88, 115(2), 318(4), 351(2) of *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023* (for short 'BNS').

3. Heard Mr.Ch.L.Narasimha Rao, learned counsel representing Mr.Ch.Venkat Raman, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, representing the respondent-State.

4. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the petitioner allegedly induced the de facto complainant to enter into a relationship with him on the promise of marrying her and, in the course of such relationship, had sexual intercourse with her on several occasions. It is further alleged that the petitioner caused her to undergo abortions on two occasions by administering tablets to her. The petitioner is also alleged to have obtained a sum of approximately Rs.16,00,000/- from the de facto complainant on the pretext of purchasing a plot and constructing a house. When the de facto complainant insisted that the petitioner marry her, he allegedly refused to do so, assaulted her, pressed her neck and threatened to kill her.

5.1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, even according to the averments in the complaint, the de facto complainant is a divorcee and was fully aware of the petitioner's marital status, including the fact that he was already married and had children. He further submits that the present complaint is a counterblast to the report lodged by the petitioner on 17.09.2026, in which he had reported an incident that allegedly occurred on 07.09.2026 at about 4:00 p.m. According to the said report, the de facto complainant had picked up a quarrel with the petitioner, abused him in derogatory terms and assaulted him.

5.2. He further contends that the allegations concerning the alleged physical relationship, payment of a sum of Rs.16,00,000/- and termination of pregnancies are false, concocted and unsupported by any material evidence. He submits that the de facto complainant is engaged in financial transactions by advancing loans and collecting interest and that, since the petitioner is working as a Police Constable in the same area, she has falsely implicated him in the present case. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents, is willing to cooperate with the investigation and undertakes to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. On these grounds, learned counsel seeks grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6.1. Per contra, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposes the petitions and submits that, when the police attempted to serve notice on the de facto complainant, she refused to receive the same. However, a copy of the notice was subsequently sent to her mobile number through WhatsApp.

6.2. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor further submits that there are specific allegations against the petitioner that he sexually and financially exploited the de facto complainant on the false promise of marriage. It is alleged that the petitioner caused her pregnancies to be terminated by administering tablets, resulting in miscarriages on two occasions. It is further alleged that, on 07.09.2026, when the de facto complainant went to

the petitioner’s newly constructed building and questioned him about the marriage, he abused and assaulted her and threatened her with dire consequences.

6.3. It is contended that the investigation is still in progress and that the petitioner's presence may be required for custodial interrogation to facilitate an effective investigation. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor further submits that granting anticipatory bail at this stage may impede the investigation and result in the petitioner failing to cooperate with the investigating agency. Accordingly, learned Additional Public Prosecutor prays for dismissal of the petitions.

7. I have considered the rival submissions and perused the material on record.

8. The gravamen of the allegations against the petitioner is that, on the pretext of love and marriage, he induced the de facto complainant to enter into a relationship and sexually exploited her on several occasions, besides obtaining approximately Rs.16,00,000/- from her on the pretext of purchasing a plot and constructing a house. It is further alleged that, when she questioned him about the marriage, he refused, assaulted and threatened her, and had earlier caused her pregnancies to be terminated on two occasions by administering tablets.

9. While considering an application for anticipatory bail, this Court is not required to undertake a meticulous examination of the prosecution material or conduct a roving enquiry into disputed questions of fact. The Court is only required to make a prima facie assessment of the allegations, without expressing any opinion on their merits. The relevant considerations include the nature and gravity of the accusation, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, his antecedents, the likelihood of his absconding or influencing witnesses, the possibility of tampering with evidence and the necessity of custodial interrogation, while balancing personal liberty against the requirements of an effective investigation.

10. In the present case, though specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioner, the aspects relating to the promise of marriage, alleged sexual and financial exploitation and termination of pregnancies require verification through an effective investigation. Both parties are adults, and it is the petitioner's contention that the de facto complainant was aware of his marital status and he stated to have represented that there were differences between him and his wife. The evidentiary significance of these circumstances, particularly in the context of the allegations of inducement and exploitation, is a matter for investigation.

11. Further, the report/complaint dated 17.09.2026, relating to the incident allegedly occurring on 07.09.2026 at about 4:00 p.m., is also a

relevant circumstance, as the petitioner contends that the present complaint is a counterblast thereto. However, the existence and timing of the said report, by themselves, cannot discredit the allegations of the de facto complainant, and the circumstances surrounding the rival complaints require investigation.

12. Having regard to the totality of the circumstances, though the allegations are serious and warrant thorough investigation, their gravity alone cannot be the sole ground for declining anticipatory bail. The petitioner is stated to be working as a Police Constable, has no criminal antecedents and is willing to cooperate with the investigation. Further, no specific material has been placed before this Court demonstrating that his custodial interrogation is indispensable for an effective investigation. The prosecution's apprehension regarding non-cooperation or interference with witnesses can be addressed by imposing appropriate conditions. Accordingly, balancing the petitioner's right to personal liberty against the interests of an effective investigation, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner is entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail, subject to appropriate conditions to ensure his cooperation and prevent any interference with the investigation.

13. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed, subject to following conditions.

(A) The petitioner/accused shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Paloncha Rural Police Station, Bhadradri Kothagudem District, on or before 21.11.2026. Upon such surrender or in the event of arrest the Station House Officer shall release him on bail on execution of 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 said officer.

(B) The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating officer on every Tuesday and Saturday between 10.00AM to 03.00PM, for a period of eight (08) weeks from the date of his release on bail or until the filing of the final result, whichever is earlier.

(C) The petitioner shall remain available for investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer and shall cooperate fully with the investigation.

(D) The petitioner shall furnish his complete residential address and contact details to the Investigating Officer and shall keep the same updated throughout the course of investigation.

(E) The petitioner shall not either directly or indirectly induce, threaten, influence, or contact any prosecution witness, nor shall he tamper with the prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

(F) The petitioner shall strictly comply with all the conditions contemplated under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

(G) Any willful breach or violation of any of the aforesaid conditions shall render the petitioner liable to appropriate proceedings before the court below, including cancellation of bail, in accordance with the provisions of the BNSS and other applicable law.

14. It is made clear that any observations made herein are confined solely to the adjudication of the present application for anticipatory bail and shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case. Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

N.TUKARAMJI, J

Date: 06.11.2026
CHS

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.17019 OF 2026

DATE: 06.11.2026

CHS