

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

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.9875 OF 2026

DATE : 07.07.2026

Between:

Jagjeet Singh

...Petitioner/Accused

AND

The State of Telangana.

...Respondent

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of the *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita*, 2023 (for short, “BNSS”), seeking the relief of anticipatory bail.

2. The petitioner is arrayed as sole accused in FIR No.104 of 2026 on the file of Mangalhat Police Station, Hyderabad, registered for the offence punishable under Section 386, 420, 406, 354C, 506 of IPC.

3. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.Syed Yasar Mahmood, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent-State.

4.1. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the petitioner allegedly induced the de facto complainant to enter into a relationship with him and, taking advantage of such relationship, exploited her

emotionally and financially. It is alleged that during the years 2016-2017, the petitioner forcibly obtained gold ornaments belonging to the de facto complainant weighing approximately forty (40) tolas and pledged/deposited the same with financial institutions/banks for obtaining monetary benefits. It is further alleged that when the de facto complainant demanded return of the said jewellery, the petitioner threatened to cause harm to her children and also threatened to defame her, thereby compelling her to distance herself from her family members and live separately.

4.2. The further allegation is that, when the de facto complainant again questioned the petitioner regarding return of the jewellery in the year 2024, he subjected her to intimidation and threatened to circulate her private photographs, which were allegedly obtained by him forcibly after assaulting her. Since the jewellery was not returned despite lapse of considerable time and as the intervention of elders did not yield any result, the de facto complainant ultimately lodged the present report, which culminated in registration of the crime.

5.1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated due to existing family disputes. It is submitted that the de facto complainant is none other than the maternal aunt of the petitioner and that the allegations arise out of strained personal and family relations.

Learned counsel further contends that the alleged acts of receiving gold ornaments and pledging/depositing the same are stated to have occurred during the years 2016-2017, whereas the complaint came to be lodged only in the year 2026. According to the learned counsel, the unexplained and inordinate delay in initiating criminal proceedings casts serious doubt on the genuineness of the allegations and indicates that the complaint is an afterthought.

5.2. It is further submitted that another complaint has also been lodged by the complainant against certain relatives alleging outraging of modesty and criminal intimidation, which, according to the petitioner, demonstrates her conduct. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is a permanent resident, there is no possibility of his absconding, and he is ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation and abide by any conditions imposed by this Court. On these grounds, learned counsel seeks grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Per contra, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the application contending that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are specific in nature and involve exploitation of the de facto complainant, wrongful retention of her gold ornaments, threats, and intimidation. It is submitted that the allegations require thorough investigation, particularly regarding the alleged pledging of jewellery and the circumstances under which the alleged acts were committed.

He further submits that the investigation is still at a nascent stage and granting pre-arrest bail at this juncture may adversely affect the investigation. Accordingly, dismissal of the petition is sought.

7. I have considered the submissions and perused the material available on record.

8. The substance of the accusation is that the petitioner allegedly exploited the relationship with the de facto complainant, obtained her gold ornaments, utilised the same for raising financial benefits and thereafter failed to either return the jewellery or repay the corresponding amount. The allegations further disclose threats and intimidation allegedly extended to the de facto complainant.

9. However, while considering an application for anticipatory bail, the Court is required to strike a balance between the individual's right to personal liberty and the necessity of a fair and effective investigation. The power under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is an extraordinary discretionary power intended to protect a person from unnecessary arrest, while ensuring that the investigation is not obstructed (see. *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 SCC 565).

10. In the present case, taking into consideration the nature of allegations, the timeline of the alleged incidents, particularly the fact

that the alleged taking of jewellery relates back to the years 2016-2017, the subsequent developments, and the willingness expressed by the petitioner to cooperate with the investigation, this Court finds that custodial interrogation of the petitioner does not appear to be indispensable at this stage. Further, no material has been placed before this Court indicating that the petitioner is likely to abscond, evade the process of law. Accordingly, having regard to the totality of the facts and circumstances and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is inclined to exercise its discretion in favour of the petitioner by granting anticipatory bail, subject to appropriate conditions to ensure his availability for investigation and to safeguard the interest of the prosecution.

11. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed, subject to the following conditions:

(A) The petitioner/Accused shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Mangalhat Police Station, Hyderabad on or before 22.07.2026. Upon such surrender or in the event of arrest the Station House Officer shall release him on bail on execution of 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 said officer.

(B) The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating officer on every Tuesday and Saturday between 10.00AM to 03.00PM, for a period of twelve (12) weeks from the date of his release on bail and shall cooperate with the investigation in all respects.

(C) The petitioner shall furnish his complete residential address and contact details to the Investigating Officer and shall keep the same updated throughout the course of investigation.

(D) The petitioner shall not either directly or indirectly induce, threaten, influence, or contact any prosecution witness, nor shall he tamper with the prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

(E) The petitioner shall strictly comply with all the conditions contemplated under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

(F) Any wilful breach or violation of any of the aforesaid conditions shall render the petitioner liable to appropriate proceedings before the court below, including cancellation of bail, in accordance with the provisions of the BNSS and other applicable law.

12. It is made clear that any observations made herein are confined solely to the adjudication of the present application for anticipatory

bail and shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Date: 07.07.2026
mmr

N.TUKARAMJI, J

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.9875 OF 2026

DATE : 07.07.2026

mmr