

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10004 of 2026

DATE: 10.07.2026

Between:

Banothu Venkatasattiram

.... Petitioner/A.12

AND

The State of Telangana,
Through P.S. Maellacheruvu,
Suryapet, Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Telangana,
High Court, Hyderabad and another

.... Respondents/
Defacto complainant.

: O R D E R :

This Criminal Petition is filed seeking the Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail, who are arrayed as accused No.12 in Crime No.178 of 2025 of Medlachervu Police Station, Suryapet District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 329(4), 118(2), 352, 351(2) and 189(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) and Section 3(1)(r)(s), 3(2)(va) of SC/ST (POA) Amendment Act, 2015.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 20.09.2025, the *de-facto* complainant lodged a report before the Police stating that on 19.09.2025, certain persons unlawfully trespassed into the complainant's house from the rear side and assaulted the complainant and his family members with sticks. They abused the complainant and his mother in filthy language and referred to them by their caste name, using derogatory expressions. As a result of the assault, the complainant sustained bleeding injuries on both hands and on his back. The accused persons also allegedly threatened the complainant and his family members to leave the village. As such, he requested the police to take necessary action. Based on the said complaint, the police registered a case for the abovementioned offences.

3. Heard Sri B. Arjun Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Sri D. Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for Respondent No.1 – State and Sri Jella Naresh Kumar, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2-defacto complainant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the allegations levelled against him and that the provisions of the SC/ST (POA) Act are not applicable to the present case and that, even according to the remand report, the

petitioner belongs to the ST community and that the allegations against the petitioner are omnibus in nature, with no specific allegations made against him. He also submitted that the other accused have already been granted bail and that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 24.06.2026 and that a substantial part of the investigation has already been completed. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioner by allowing this criminal petition.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 opposed the bail petition, contending that the present petition is not maintainable as the petitioner has not approached the trial Court and has directly filed the bail petition before this Court. He submitted that, as per Section 14 of the Act, the petitioner has to approach the Special Court and as such, this petition is not maintainable. He further submitted that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature and that the anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner earlier was already dismissed by this Court. Therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to bail and he prayed this Court to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

6. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious and grave in

nature and that the injured sustained grievous fracture injuries and was in the hospital for a considerable period. He further submitted that the Special Act is not applicable to the petitioner and that the investigation is still in progress and that, if released on bail, the petitioner may hamper the investigation. Therefore, he contended that the petitioner is not entitled to bail at this stage and prayed the Court to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

7. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned counsel for respondent No.2, and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is evident that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 24.06.2026. As per the remand case diary, the prosecution witnesses, namely LWs.1 to 19, have already been examined. With regard to the contention raised by the learned counsel for respondent No.2, Section 14 of the Act is not applicable and even according to the remand report, there is no such bar for directly filing an application. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case and the stage of investigation, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/Accused No.12, 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 learned Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate at Huzurnagar.
- 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).

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 10.07.2026
SS

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10004 of 2026

Date: 10.07.2026

SS