

**IN THE COURT OF THE ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE FOR THE TRIAL OF
JUBILEE HILLS CAR BOMB BLAST CASE-CUM-ADDL. FAMILY COURT-
CUM-XXIII ADDL. CHIEF JUDGE-CUM- IX ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE,
HYDERABAD**

Dated this the 09th Day of September, 2025

PRESENT: T.Anitha

Special Judge for trial of Protection of Children
from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act cases-cum-
XII Addl. Sessions Judge,
FAC.Addl. Sessions Judge
for the Trial of JHCBBC-Cum-Addl. Family
Court-cum- XXIII Addl. Chief Judge-Cum-
IX Addl Sessions Judge, Hyderabad.

Crl.M.P No 4549 of 2025

in

Cr. No. 515 of 2025

(P.S. Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad)

Between:

Jogu Shiva S/o Kumar Swamy
Age : 24 years, Occ: Hotel reception,
R/o 2nd Floor, Pizzahut building,
Pillar No. C1574, Road No. 5,
Venkatagiri, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad.

... Petitioners/Accused No.2

AND

The State of Telangana
Through PS Jubilee Hills,
Hyderabad.

... Respondent/Complainant

This Petition is coming on before me for hearing in the presence of Sri. D. Rakesh counsel for the Petitioner/Accused No.2 and Smt M. Rajini, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and upon perusing the material on record and having stood over for consideration, this Court made the following:-

ORDER

1. This second bail petition is filed by the petitioner/Accused No.2 under Section 483 of BNSS seeking regular bail in Cr.No.515 of 2025, PS Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 143(3), 144(2), 60 r/w 3(5) of BNS and under Sections 3,4,5,6 and 7 of Prevention of Immoral Traffic Act, 1956. The petitioner/A2 is in judicial custody from 07-08-2025.

2. Notice is given to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the State who filed counter opposing the bail petition of the petitioner/Accused No.2.

3. The brief averments of the petition are that the petitioner/A2 is denying all the allegations levelled against him and that the police have falsely implicated him in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner/A2 is suffering with kidney infection and undergoing treatment and if timely medication is not provided, there will be high risk of kidney failure. Further submitted that police have completed entire investigation, as such, custodial interrogation of the petitioner/A2 is no more required. The petitioner/A2 undertakes that he will not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer. He further undertakes not to tamper with the evidence or the witnesses in any manner and he is ready to furnish sufficient sureties to the satisfaction of this court and also ready to abide by any conditions imposed by this court for his release. Hence, prayed to grant bail to him.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has filed counter opposing the bail stating that the petitioner/A2 admitted in his confessional statement that he along with hotel owners (A3 & A4) knowingly allowed the hotel premises to be used for prostitution for monetary gain. It is further submitted that the petitioner/A2 regularly coordinated with A1 through phone numbers provided, indicating that his role was crucial in connecting organizers with customers. Since A1 is absconding, releasing A2 may hamper efforts to trace him. Further digital evidence (call records, UPI payments, chat logs) are still under verification and if he is released, A2 could tamper with mobile data, financial records or delete chats. Further, the petitioner/A2 may

threaten or influence the rescued victim or customers who gave confessions. Hence, prayed to dismiss the petition.

5. Heard both sides.

6. Now the point for determination is: "Whether bail can be granted to the petitioner/Accused No.2 in the above crime at this stage?"

7. The brief facts of the prosecution is that on 06-08-2025, the Detective Inspector of Police, PS Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad, conducted raid on a brothel house situated at LV Hotel, 2nd floor, Divyasai Enclave, Road No.5, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad and apprehended three sub-organizers and two customers besides rescuing a victim women/sec worker from the premises.

8. Perused the case record. Earlier bail application was dismissed on 22-08-2025 vide Crl.M.P.No. 4242 of 2025. The learned counsel for the petitioner/A2 submitted that police have completed entire investigation, as such, custodial interrogation of the petitioner/A2 is no more required and undertakes that he will not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer. The learned counsel for the petitioner/A2 further submitted that the petitioner/A2 is suffering with kidney infection and undergoing treatment and if timely medication is not provided, there will be high risk of kidney failure and they are ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Hon'ble Court. On the other hand learned APP opposed the bail to the petitioner/A2 contending that further digital evidence (call records, UPI payments, chat logs) are still under verification and if he is released, A2 could tamper with mobile data, financial records or delete chats. The petitioner/A2 is in judicial custody from 07-08-2025. The said

period of remand is sufficient to complete the investigation. Hence on considering the facts and circumstances of the case and on considering the medical condition of petitioner and remand period of the accused this court is of the view that it is a fit case to enlarge the petitioner/A2 on bail. The Point is answered accordingly.

9. In the result, the petition is allowed by enlarging the petitioner/A2 on bail on his executing personal bond for Rs.20,000/ (Rupees Twenty thousand only) with two local sureties for like sum each to the satisfaction of XVII Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate Court Hyderabad and on the following conditions.

- (1) The Petitioner/A2 shall comply with all the terms and conditions of the bond executed by him.
- (2) The Petitioner/A2 shall cooperate in the investigation/trial, as the case may be.
- (3) The Petitioner/A2 will not indulge himself in extending inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to the Police Officer, as the case may be.
- (4) The Petitioner/A2 shall not leave India without prior permission of the court.

Typed to my dictation by Copyist of this court, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 09th day of September, 2025.

Sd/-
XII ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE,
FAC IX ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE,
HYDERABAD