

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.9986 of 2026

DATE: 09.07.2026

BETWEEN:

Bandi Sai Bageerath @ Bhageerath.

Petitioner/accused

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
at Hyderabad, and another.

.....Respondents

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused in Crime No.684 of 2026 before the Petbasheerabad Police Station, Medchal-Malkajgiri District, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 64(2)(m), 74, 75 of BNS, and Section 5(l) r/w 6 of POCSO Act, 2012.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the mother of the victim girl lodged a complaint on 08.05.2026 stating that her minor daughter, aged 17 years, was befriended by the petitioner in June, 2025 through mutual friends and social media platforms. It is alleged that the petitioner developed a relationship with the victim on a false promise of marriage, controlled her movements, and subjected her to repeated sexual assault on different occasions. It is further alleged that incidents took place in the apartment basement, at Golf View Apartments, Nanakramguda, at Lux Charan Farm Stay, Moinabad, and at Ananya Farms, Moinabad during the night of 31.12.2025 and 01.01.2026. It is also alleged that the petitioner pressured the victim to consume alcohol and thereafter subjected her to further sexual assault, and that he later circulated private pictures of the victim and defamed her in the social circle.

3. Heard Sri T. Niranjan Reddy, learned Senior counsel appearing for Sri C. Sharan Reddy, learned counsel for petitioner, Sri Palle Nageshwar Rao, learned Public Prosecutor, appearing for respondent No.1 – State, and Sri Pappu Nageshwar Rao, learned Senior counsel appearing for

Smt. V. Mythili, learned counsel for respondent No.2/de facto complainant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent, that he has been falsely implicated, and that the complaint is belated. He submitted that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 16.05.2026, that the petitioner cooperated with the investigation including police custody, that the victim and material witnesses have already been examined, and that the investigation is complete except for filing of charge sheet. He further submitted that the petitioner had earlier obtained interim bail to attend his BBA supplementary examinations from 22.06.2026 to 24.06.2026, complied with all conditions, and surrendered on time. While averring that during interim bail period there was no allegation on petitioner relating to misuse of liberty granted by this Court for writing BBA exams, and considering the conduct of petitioner, he prayed to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail.

5. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor appearing for respondent No.1-State opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and contended that the allegations are grave in nature, that the victim is a minor, that the petitioner abused the relationship and sexually exploited her on multiple occasions, and that there is every likelihood of the petitioner influencing witnesses and tampering with evidence, if released on bail. Therefore, he prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 filed written arguments stating that the victim is a minor aged 17 years, that the investigation has not fully concluded, and that certain crucial witnesses whose names were revealed by her are not examined as on today, and few other circumstances still require examination, including school records, persons acquainted with the victim and accused, and other circumstantial witnesses. While averring that the nature of the allegations is serious, and investigation is not yet completed, granting bail at this stage would prejudice the prosecution case. In support of the said contentions, reliance was placed upon the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court

in the case of **Shankar Finance and Investments v. State of Andhra Pradesh and Others**¹, **Praveen v. Mohd. Tajuddin**², **A.C. Narayanan v. State of Maharashtra and Another**³, and **Vinita S. Rao v. Essen Corporate Services Private Limited and Another**⁴, and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

7. Having regard to the rival submissions made, and on perusing the material placed on record, it is noted that learned counsel for petitioner asserts petitioner has been in jail since last 55 days and LWs.1 to 25 are already examined, as such, further incarceration of petitioner is not necessary, whereas, the primary objection of de facto complainant is that though the prosecution submits that the investigation in the case is completed, it is to be seen that the victim herself, and the names referred to by her, who are common friends of accused and victim, are not examined as on today, and on that sole ground itself, it can be said that the investigation is not yet completed. However, it is the specific stand of learned Public Prosecutor that the averments of counter would clearly

¹ [(2008) 8 SCC 536]

² [(2009) 12 SCC 706]

³ [(2014) 11 SCC 790]

⁴ [(2015) 1 SCC 527]

show that investigation in the case is almost completed, except for filing of chargesheet.

8. At this stage, it is apposite to note that the grant of bail is governed by well-settled principles. While considering an application for bail, the Court is required to strike a balance between the fundamental right to personal liberty of the accused and the interest of a fair investigation and administration of criminal justice. The Court must, inter alia, satisfy itself that the accused is not likely to abscond or evade the process of law, that there is no reasonable apprehension of his influencing or intimidating the victim or prosecution witnesses, tampering with the evidence, or otherwise obstructing the course of justice, and that his release would not prejudice the investigation or the fair conduct of the trial. Once the Court is satisfied that these considerations can be adequately safeguarded, either on the facts of the case or by imposing appropriate and stringent conditions, continued incarceration pending investigation would ordinarily be unwarranted and the accused may be enlarged on bail.

9. Applying the aforesaid principles to the facts of the present case, this Court finds that the primary objection raised by the learned counsel for respondent No.2/de facto complainant is the apprehension that, if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every likelihood of his influencing or threatening the victim as well as the prosecution witnesses. It is also contended that the investigation is not yet complete as the Forensic Science Laboratory report has not been received. However, the learned Public Prosecutor has placed before this Court, in a sealed cover, the statement recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS along with the Forensic Science Laboratory report. Further, in so far as the grievance of the de facto complainant regarding the manner of investigation is concerned, it is always open to her to avail the remedy before the appropriate forum, in accordance with law, at the appropriate stage.

10. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case in their entirety, and keeping in view the apprehensions expressed by the de facto complainant, this Court is of the considered opinion that the same can be adequately addressed by imposing stringent conditions. Accordingly, this

Court deems it fit to enlarge the petitioner on bail, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees one lakh only) with two sureties for a like sum each, to the satisfaction of the IX Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, at Medchal.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 a.m. on every Monday 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 shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C. (presently Section 480(3) of the BNSS).
- iv. The petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, contact, approach, communicate with, or attempt to influence the victim, the de facto complainant, or any of the prosecution witnesses, in any manner whatsoever.
- v. The petitioner shall not visit the locality, educational institution, residence, workplace, or any place frequented by the victim or the de facto complainant,

except for attending Court or when specifically permitted by law.

- vi. The petitioner shall not indulge in any act of intimidation, inducement, threat, coercion, harassment, or abuse, either personally or through any third party, against the victim, the de facto complainant, or any witness in the case.
- vii. The petitioner shall not make any public statement, post, upload, share, forward, or circulate any content, whether textual, audio, visual, or electronic, concerning the facts of the case, the victim, the de facto complainant, or the witnesses, on any social media platform or otherwise.
- viii. The petitioner shall not give interviews, press statements, podcasts, public comments, or media briefings, directly or indirectly, in relation to the present crime or the subject matter thereof, until conclusion of trial.
- ix. The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court and shall not leave India without prior permission of competent Court.
- x. In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, it shall be open to the prosecution or defacto complainant to seek cancellation of bail.

11. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Date: 09.07.2026
PT

K. SUJANA, J

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.9986 of 2026

Date: 09.07.2026

PT