IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.18830 of 2026
(CNR No.HBHC010787122026)

DATED: 25.11.2026

BETWEEN:

Nannuri Vijay Kumar Reddy .... Petitioner/Accused No.3

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
at Hyderabad, through the Deputy
Superintendent of Police, Anti-Corruption Bureau,
R.R. District, Hyderabad

.... Respondent/Complainant

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Sections 480 and 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking to enlarge the petitioner, who is arrayed as accused No.3 in Crime No.16/RCT-ACB-RRR/2026, ACB, Rangareddy Range, on bail. The said crime was registered for the offences punishable under Sections 7 (a) of the Preventtion of Corruption Act, 1988 (as amended in 2018).

2. The brief facts of the prosecution case are that Accused No.1, who was working as Deputy Tahsildar, Keesara Mandal, allegedly demanded a bribe of Rs.5,00,000/- from the *de-facto* complainant to remove the agricultural properties belonging to his family from the Prohibited List (Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908) in the Bhu Bharati Portal. It is

further alleged that the accused No.1 received Rs.2,50,000/- from the de-facto complainant through accused No.2 and petitioner/accused No.3, who were working as Assistant to the Deputy Tahsildar and Village Revenue Officer respectively.

3. Heard Mr. B. Sathish, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. M. Vivekananda Reddy, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was not named in the complaint dated 23.09.2026 and that the attributions in the complaint were made only against accused No.1. It is further contended that the de-facto complainant placed the tainted amount in the lunch bag of accused No.2, who in turn kept it in an almirah. It is also contended that the chemical test on both the hands of the petitioner yielded negative results and that no amount was recovered from or at the instance of the petitioner. Therefore, learned counsel prayed to grant bail to the petitioner by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, the learned Special Public Prosecutor for ACB appearing for the respondent while opposing the bail application submitted on instructions that though material part of investigation is completed, charge sheet is yet to be filed and thus, prayed for dismissal of the criminal petition.

6. On perusal of the remand case diary, it is evident that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 16.10.2026. The investigating agency had examined material witnesses. The material collected during the investigation does not indicate that the petitioner/accused No.3 was the recipient of the tainted money. The only allegation against the petitioner (Accused No. 3) is that he instructed the *de-facto* complainant to wait outside the section and handover the money to Accused No. 2. Thus, the role attributed to the petitioner is limited to the alleged facilitation of the transaction. Moreover, the material placed before this Court does not indicate any specific requirement of further custodial interrogation of the petitioner.

7. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations against the petitioner and since substantial part of the investigation appears to have been completed and also considering the period of incarceration, this Court is of the considered view that further detention of the petitioner may not be necessary. Further the petitioner stated to have no criminal antecedents. In these circumstances, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, subject to his complying with following conditions:

i. The petitioner-A3 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 learned I Additional Special Judge for Trial of SPE and ACB Cases, Hyderabad.

ii. The petitioner-A3 shall appear before the concerned SHO between 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., on every Sunday 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-A3 shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C. (presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).

iv. The petitioner-A3 shall not directly or indirectly influence, threaten, or 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.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY, J

Date: 25.11.2026
AS

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.18830 of 2026

DATED: 25.11.2026

AS