

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

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

**CRIMINAL PETITION No.5305 OF 2026**

**DATE: 28.04.2026**

**Between :**

Rohith Panjugula @ Pilot Rohit Reddy

... Petitioner/Accused No.2

**And**

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

... Respondent/Complainant

**: ORDER :**

This Criminal Petition is filed under Sections 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Surakhsha Sanhita, 2023 praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused No.2 in Crime No.150 of 2026 of Moinabad Police Station, Future City. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 8(c), 22(a), 27 and 29 of NDPS Act, Sections 25(1B)(a),

27, 30 of Arms Act, 1959, Section 34(a) of Telangana Excise Act and Sections 49, 109, 132 r/w 3(5) of BNS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that, on 14.03.2026, on receipt of credible information, Sub-Inspector of Police, Moinabad Police Station, Cyberabad, came to know that certain individuals had assembled at the petitioner's farmhouse and were allegedly consuming narcotic and psychotropic substances along with liquor during a party. Acting upon the said information, he complied with the requirements under Section 42(2) of the NDPS Act and conducted raid. Upon reaching the farmhouse at about 20:30 hours, the police team surrounded the premises and announced their presence. At that time, a gunshot was allegedly fired from inside the farmhouse towards the police team, accompanied by threats from persons inside. Subsequently, the police entered the premises and apprehended one Namith Sharma (A-1), who was found in possession of a revolver, and another individual, Silvari Sharath Kumar, who was holding empty cartridges. Based on the alleged voluntary confession of accused Kaushik Ravi (A-4), it was revealed that cocaine had been procured from an unknown person and brought to the party. Further, upon conducting urine drug tests on the individuals present, namely Tiruveedula Arjun

Reddy, Kaushik Ravi, Rithesh Reddy Panjugula, Namith Sharma, and Panjugula Rohith Reddy, all tested positive for drug consumption. Consequently, a case was registered against the accused for the above mentioned offences.

3. Heard Sri T. Pradhumnya Reddy, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of Sri T. Anirudh Reddy, learned counsel the petitioner and Sri Pallu Nageshwar Rao, learned Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent - State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case and that while several persons were present at the alleged scene, only the petitioner along with A-1 and A-3 were arrested and remanded, whereas the other accused were released upon issuance of notice under Section 35(3) BNSS. He further submitted that the petitioner neither possessed nor used any firearm and is not connected with the alleged weapon, thereby the offences under the Arms Act is not applicable. He further contended that no contraband was recovered from the petitioner, and the seized quantity of 0.26 grams of cocaine is below small quantity and that the petitioner stands on the same footing as the other accused who were released on notice. He

further contended that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 15.03.2026, and the material part of investigation has already been completed. Therefore, he prayed this Court to grant regular bail to the petitioner by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor opposed the bail petition by filing a counter affidavit, contending that the petitioner/A-2 is the main kingpin and organizer of the illegal drug party and the owner of the farmhouse where the alleged offences took place and that the petitioner is charged with serious and non-bailable offences under the NDPS Act, Arms Act, TSEA Act, and relevant provisions of the BNS, including Section 109 BNS. He further contended that the petitioner instigated A-1 to open fire on the police by exhorting him to “shoot,” which clearly establishes his role in abetment and criminal conspiracy and the positive urine drug test further indicates his involvement in narcotic consumption and that the investigation is still in progress. He also brought to the notice of the Court the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, submitting that though some cases ended in acquittal or closure, a few are still pending trial or under investigation, indicating his involvement in multiple criminal cases. Therefore, the petitioner

is not entitled to bail and prayed the Court to dismiss this petition.

6. Having regard to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the offences alleged against the petitioner are punishable under Sections 8(c), 22(a), 27 and 29 of the NDPS Act, Sections 25(1B)(a), 27 and 30 of the Arms Act, 1959, Section 34(a) of the Telangana Excise Act, and Sections 49, 109, 132 read with 3(5) of the BNS. The principal allegation against the petitioner is that he was found in possession of 0.26 grams of cocaine, which constitutes a small quantity under the NDPS Act. It is further alleged that the petitioner instigated Accused No.1 to fire upon police officers. However, the record reflects that the firing was allegedly done in the air. The petitioner has also relied upon a statement made by the Media Eagle Team, wherein it was stated that there was no attack on the police either by the petitioner or by Accused No.1. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that four custody petitions filed by the prosecution were allowed by the trial Court, and the petitioner was subjected to custodial interrogation. However, the last custody petition was dismissed,

indicating that sufficient opportunity had already been granted to the investigating agency.

7. The prosecution contended that the petitioner has not disclosed crucial facts during investigation and that certain facts were revealed intermittently during custodial interrogation. The petitioner has been in judicial custody since 14.03.2026. Learned Public Prosecutor has placed reliance on various judgments, including **P. Chidambaram Vs. Directorate of Enforcement**<sup>1</sup>, to contend that adequate time must be given for investigation; **Union of India and Others Vs. Bharat Chaudhary and another**<sup>2</sup>, highlighting the adverse societal impact of drug offences; **Chandakeshwar Prasad @ Chandu Babu Vs. State of Bihar and Anr.**<sup>3</sup> emphasizing the need to balance individual liberty with societal interest; **K. Mehfuz Ali Khan Vs. The State of Andhra Pradesh**<sup>4</sup> to argue that bail should not be granted in serious offences; **Yerragudi Suryanarayana Reddy vs. Senior Intelligence Officer, DRI**<sup>5</sup>, stating that intermediate quantity is not a ground for bail; **Zeba**

---

<sup>1</sup> (2019) 9 SCC 24

<sup>2</sup> CrI.O.P.Nos. 18540 of 2020, 6056, 6115 and 6224 of 2021

<sup>3</sup> 2016 0 AIR (SC) 4524

<sup>4</sup> 2014 1 ALD (Cri) 215

<sup>5</sup> 2017 3 Crimes (HC) 493

**Khan vs. State of U.P.** <sup>6</sup>, regarding non-disclosure of antecedents; and **Naushey Ali vs. State of U.P.** <sup>7</sup>, wherein offences under Section 307 IPC and the Arms Act are treated as grave offences against society.

8. On the other hand, it is an undisputed fact that the contraband allegedly seized from the petitioner falls within the category of small quantity. There is no previous case registered against the petitioner under the NDPS Act. Though allegations are made that the petitioner was involved in consumption and arranging narcotic substances on several occasions, no prior crime under the NDPS Act has been registered against him. As regards the criminal antecedents, it is evident that the petitioner was involved in several cases; however, most of them have resulted in acquittal or have been settled before the Lok Adalat. The pending cases include Crime No.203 of 2019 (under Sections 171-B and 171-H IPC), Crime No.69 of 2019 (under Section 188 IPC), Crime No.97 of 2018 (under Sections 353, 504, 506 read with 34 IPC), Crime No.47 of 2026 (under Sections 132, 352 r/w 189(2), 126(2) 223 of BNS), Crime No.50

---

<sup>6</sup> 2026 0 INSC 144

<sup>7</sup> 2025 0 AIR (SC) 1035

of 2026 (under Sections 132, 189(2), 126(2) and 223 of BNS) and the present crime.

9. Taking into consideration the nature of allegations, the fact that the contraband is of small quantity, the period of incarceration of the petitioner since 15.03.2026, the completion of substantial custodial interrogation, this Court is inclined to grant regular 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 Additional Junior Civil Judge-cum-XII Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Ranga Reddy District at Rajendranagar.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m and 5.00 p.m., on every Wednesday 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 483(2) of the BNSS.
- iv. The petitioner shall deposit his passport before the trial Court and he shall not leave the jurisdiction of the Court without prior permission of the trial Court.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Date: 28.04.2026

ss

---

**K. SUJANA, J**

**THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA**

**CRIMINAL PETITION No.5305 OF 2026**

**Date: 28.04.2026**