

**THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA**

**CRIMINAL PETITION No.12013 of 2025**

**ORDER:**

Seeking the Court to enlarge the petitioner who is arrayed as accused in Crime No.152 of 2025 of Nampally Police Station, Hyderabad, on bail, the present Criminal Petition is filed.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the de facto complainant lodged a complaint on 10.06.2025 stating that the petitioner had intentionally insulted and humiliated him with caste-based remarks on 30.01.2024 at Singareni Bhavan, Hyderabad, and thereafter continuously harassed him by making false complaints to State and Central Government authorities, filing writ petitions with caste-based allegations, sharing videos of High Court proceedings through WhatsApp, and spreading defamatory material that caused him mental agony and tarnished the image of SCCL.

3. Heard Sri P. Ravindra Reddy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as D. Arun Kumar, learned

Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent - State and Sri B. Madam Mohan Rao, learned Senior Counsel representing Sri P. Sri Harsha Reddy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the allegations in the complaint were false and created at the instance of the de facto complainant to implicate the petitioner and that there was a long delay of more than one year between the alleged incident of 30.01.2024 and the report lodged on 10.06.2025, which itself showed that the complaint was concocted. He further submitted that no specific date was mentioned when the alleged eyewitness informed the complainant and that the alleged caste remarks were not said to have been made in public view and that the previous cases referred by the prosecution were false and that in some of them the petitioner had already been acquitted.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that none of the ingredients of Sections 506, 504, 290 IPC Section 3(1)(p)(q)(r)(s) of the SC/ST (POA) Act were made out against the petitioner and that the petitioner himself belonged to

Scheduled Caste (Mala) and conversion into Christianity would not take away his caste status for the purpose of the Act. He further contended that the prosecution had already completed investigation, and there was no scope for tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioner by allowing this criminal petition.

6. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner stating that the allegations leveled against the petitioner are serious in nature. Further, the investigation was not yet completed. At this stage, granting of bail to the petitioner does not arise. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

7. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No.2 submitted that the petitioner/accused had a history of corruption, misconduct, and criminal cases, including pending ACB cases involving misappropriation of funds and medical board fraud, and had been previously dismissed from SCCL on such charges and that the petitioner, out of grudge,

continuously harassed respondent No.2 by making false complaints, filing frivolous writ petitions with caste-based remarks, and even illegally recording and circulating High Court proceedings, thereby tarnishing both the reputation of Respondent No.2 and the image of SCCL. He further submitted that there was every likelihood of the petitioner repeating the offence, influencing witnesses, and hampering the ongoing investigation. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

8. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 01.08.2025. As seen from the record, the substantial part of the investigation has already been completed and no further custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, as well as the period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner, this Court deems it fit to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) each, with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the Special Judge for Trial of Offences under SCs & STs (POA) Act-cum-VI Additional Sessions Judge, Secunderabad.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 a.m., on every Monday for a period of eight (8) week 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).

9. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

---

**K. SUJANA, J**

Date: 06.10.2025  
SAI

**THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA**

**CRIMINAL PETITION No.12013 of 2025**

**Date: 06.10.2025**

sai