IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.18249 of 2026
(CNR No. HBHC010763442026)
13TH NOVEMBER, 2026

Between:

A. Vidya Sagar … Petitioner

AND

The State of Telangana
Through Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad.

…Respondent/Complainant

:ORDER :

Petitioner/accused has filed the petition under Sections 480 and 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhitha, 2023 seeking bail in Crime No.472 of 2026 of P.S. Film Nagar, Hyderabad, registered for the offence under Section 69 of BNS.

2. Heard Mr. A. Arvind Reddy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri D. Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State and perused the record.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the *de-facto* complainant and the petitioner/accused were working together at Vijaya Diagnostics, Film Nagar. During their acquaintance, the petitioner/accused allegedly

promised to divorce his wife and marry the *de-facto* complainant, gained her confidence and established physical relations with her on several occasions in the year 2024. Subsequently, when the complainant questioned him about marriage, the petitioner/accused allegedly refused and threatened her. Based on the complaint dated 29.09.2026, the Police registered FIR No.472 of 2026 for the offence punishable under Section 69 of the BNS against the petitioner/accused and during the course of investigation, he was arrested on 30.09.2026 and remanded to judicial custody

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner/accused submits that the petitioner/accused had earlier filed a bail application in Crl.M.P.No.4654 of 2026 before the learned X Metropolitan Sessions Judge, Hyderabad at Nampally, which was dismissed on 22.10.2026. It is contended that, during the hearing of the said application, the *de-facto* complainant personally appeared before the trail Court and stated that she had not lodged the complaint, was unaware of its contents, and had been compelled to sign the same. She further expressed her intention to withdraw the complaint and sought the release of the petitioner/accused on bail. It is further submitted that an affidavit of the *de-facto* complainant to the said effect was also filed along with the bail application; however, the same was not taken into consideration while dismissing the bail application. Hence, prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner/accused.

5. *Per contra*, learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that petitioner has committed grave offence, investigation is under progress and if the petitioner/accused granted bail at this stage, he may tamper the evidence and may threaten the witnesses, and hence, prayed to dismiss the petition.

6. Having considered the rival submissions made by the learned counsel for the respective parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is observed that the *de-facto* complainant intends to withdraw the complaint on the ground that it was lodged without her knowledge. An application to that effect has also been filed before the trial Court, but the same has not yet been considered. It is further observed that the petitioner/accused was arrested on 30.09.2026 and has been in judicial custody for more than 40 days.

7. Taking into consideration of the above said facts and circumstances of the case; this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/accused, subject to the following conditions:

i. **The petitioner/accused shall be released on bail on his executing a personal bond for Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties for the like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned XVII Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate at Hyderabad.**

ii. **The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 a.m., on every Monday for a period of eight (8) weeks, for the purpose of investigation, and thereafter, as and when required.**

iii. **The petitioner/accused shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C., (Presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).**

iv. **The petitioner/accused shall not directly or indirectly influence, threaten induce any of the prosecution witnesses.**

v. **In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, the prosecution is at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail.**

Petition is allowed accordingly.

JUVVADI SRIDEVI, J

Date: 13.11.2026
FM/SMK

HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.18249 of 2026

13TH NOVEMBER, 2026

FM/SMK