

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8328 of 2026

DATE: 12.06.2026

Between:

Mididoddi Srikanth

...Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court at Hyderabad,
Through SHO, PS S. R. Nagar.

.... Respondent/Complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed before this Court for grant of bail to the Petitioner who is arrayed as accused in FIR No.177 of 2026 of S. R. Nagar Police Station, Hyderabad District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 69 and 88 of the BNS.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 25.03.2026, the de-facto complainant lodged a report before the police stating that she

joined in SS Associates and in the month of October 2024, she got acquainted with the petitioner herein, who was working in SS Associates (same office). After that they both exchanged their phone numbers and they both used to chat and talk on calls daily. Then the petitioner herein proposed to her and informed her that he would marry her. The complainant trusted his words and became very close in chatting and phone calls. In November 2024, the petitioner told her that however, they are going to get married, so asked her to meet physically. Then, she refused and told him that she would only meet him after marriage. Again in December 2024, he asked her to meet physically, that however they would get marry. She believed it to be true and accepted his proposal and met physically in SS Associates office. They both physically met multiple times and she got pregnant and after that he forced her to get abortion and made her forcefully aborted. After removing pregnancy, they had again physical intercourse. She asked him to marry and he changed his words and is not responding and postponing the marriage. She questioned him about marriage again and then she came to know that he got married already and had a son. He promised her that he will marry her but he used her physically and then he broke his promise. Hence, the complainant requested to take necessary action. Basing on the said complaint, the police registered a case for the above said offences.

3. Heard Sri Srikanth Chintala, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the allegations and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submitted that the complaint itself states that the victim became acquainted with the petitioner in October 2024, whereas the remand report states that they became acquainted in August 2024. According to the learned counsel, this inconsistency itself demonstrates a contradiction in the prosecution's case. He further submitted that the petitioner is the owner of SS Associates and that the victim was an employee of the said establishment. Therefore, the victim was fully aware of the petitioner's marital status. Despite such knowledge, she voluntarily developed a close relationship with the petitioner. He further submitted that he is in jail since 25.04.2026 and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for further investigation. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to him by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the

petitioner stating that the allegations against the petitioner herein are serious and grievous in nature and the victim is aged about 20 years and the petitioner herein is aged about 35 years and he abused the victim physically, as such, he is not entitled for bail. Further, the investigation is not yet completed. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. 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 herein is in jail since 25.04.2026 and as seen from the record, there is no inconsistency in the dates of acquaintance of the petitioner with the de-facto complainant. As seen from the remand case diary, the prosecution witnesses, LWs 1 to 10 have already been examined. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations, the stage of investigation, the duration of incarceration, this Court finds it appropriate 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), with two sureties for a like sum each to the

satisfaction of the learned III Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, 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 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).

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Date: 12.06.2026
TU

K. SUJANA, J

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8328 OF 2026

DATE 12.06.2026

TU