IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD
THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.18426 of 2026

(C.N.R.No.HBHC010769252026)

DATED 13TH NOVEMBER, 2026

Between:
Nadipi Sai Teja

… Petitioner/Accused No.2

AND

The State of Telangana

…Respondent/Complainant

ORDER:

Petitioner/accused No.2 has filed this petition under Sections 480 and 483 of BNSS, seeking bail in Crime No.248 of 2026 on the file of Jogipet Police Station, Sangareddy District, registered for the offences under Sections 140(3), 329(4), 75 and 351(3) read with Section 3(5) of BNS.

2. Heard Sri Akkam Eshwar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri D. Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State. Perused the record.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 26.10.2026 at about 15:00 hours, the complainant lodged a complaint stating that her brother-in-law, A-1, had been harassing her mentally, expressing

sexual desire towards her, which she had refused. On 26.10.2026 at about 12:00 noon, while she was alone in her room, the petitioner herein, along with A-1, came there in a car. It is alleged that A-1 forcibly took the complainant and her minor daughter and dragged them into the car, while the petitioner herein drove the car towards Sangareddy. On reaching Thaddhanpally Toll Gate, the complainant managed to escape from the car along with her daughter and thereafter informed her husband. Basing on the said complaint, the present crime was registered. The petitioner/accused No.2 was apprehended on 27.10.2026 and remanded to judicial custody.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case and that the petitioner was engaged as a driver by A-1 and had no knowledge of the alleged personal dispute between A-1 and the complainant. He further submitted that the petitioner had no intention or knowledge of the alleged acts of A-1 and that his alleged role was only that of driving the car. He contended that the case of the prosecution is substantially based on the alleged confession of the petitioner while in police custody, which is inadmissible in evidence. He further contended that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 27.10.2026, that he is a driver by

profession and that his driving licence, wallet and mobile phone are in the custody of the police. Hence, he prayed to enlarge the petitioner/accused No.2 on bail.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the application stating that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature and that he actively assisted A-1 in taking the complainant and her minor daughter in the car. Hence, he prayed to dismiss the petition.

6. On a perusal of the complaint and the material available on record, it is apparent that the specific allegation against the petitioner herein is that he drove the car in which A-1 allegedly took the complainant and her minor daughter. The petitioner has been in judicial custody since 27.10.2026. The petitioner claims that he was engaged as a driver by A-1 and had no knowledge of the alleged intention of A-1. Considering the nature of the allegations, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, the period of incarceration undergone by him and the fact that this is his first bail application before this Court, this Court is of the considered view that it is a fit case for grant of bail, subject to the following conditions:

i. **The petitioner/accused No.2 shall be enlarged on bail on his executing a personal bond for Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten thousand only) with two sureties for a**

like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial First Class Magistrate, Andole at Jogipet, Sangareddy District.

ii. **The petitioner/accused No.1 shall appear before the concerned Station House Officer twice in a month i.e., on 1st and 15th of every month, till filing of charge sheet or for four (04) months, whichever is earlier.**

iii. **The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly contact, threaten or induce the complainant or any other prosecution witnesses and shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence.**

iv. **The petitioner shall not leave the jurisdiction of the Court without prior permission of the learned Magistrate.**

v. **The petitioner shall comply with the conditions stipulated under Section 480(3) of BNSS.**

vi. **In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, the prosecution is at liberty to seek cancellation of bail in accordance with law.**

Petition is allowed accordingly.

JUVVADI SRIDEVI, J

Date: 13.11.2026
Lpd

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.18426 of 2026

(C.N.R.No.HBHC010769252026)

Date: 13.11.2026
Lpd