

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

**AT HYDERABAD**

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

**CRIMINAL PETITION No.10288 OF 2026**

**DATE : 21.07.2026**

**Between :**

Katyada Bapurao

... Petitioner/A.1

**And**

The State of Telangana,  
Rep., by its Public Prosecutor,  
High Court for the State of Telangana  
At Hyderabad, through SHO,  
Gandhari Police Station

... Respondent/Complainant

**: ORDER :**

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 by the petitioner praying this Court to enlarge him on bail who is accused No.1 in Crime No.108 of 2026 of Gandhari Police Station, Kamareddy District. The offence alleged against the petitioner is under Section 308 (5), 338, 336(3), 339, 351(2) r/w. Section 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 04.06.2026 at about 5:30 p.m., the de facto complainant lodged a complaint

stating that he and his partners had undertaken the development of 43 guntas of land in Gandhari Village. During the course of development, the petitioner/Bapurao, along with another person, introduced themselves as journalists of Prashna Ayudham newspaper and falsely alleged that the venture was illegal. It is alleged that they repeatedly threatened the complainant and his partners with filing false complaints before various authorities and demanded Rs.30,00,000/-, threatening them with dire consequences. Out of fear, the complainant and his partners allegedly paid Rs.4,80,000/- on different occasions, partly in cash and partly through online transfer. The accused are also alleged to have threatened the complainant by showing a knife and continued to demand the balance amount even after the petitioner was released on bail in another case. Alleging that the petitioner and the co-accused were extorting money under the guise of journalism and by threatening to file complaints under the Right to Information Act, the complainant sought legal action against them. Based on the said complaint, the present Crime is registered against the accused for the above offences.

3. Heard Sri K.Sanjeev, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri D.Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the allegations relate to transactions said to have taken place during the year 2024, whereas the complaint was lodged only on 04.06.2026, after an inordinate and unexplained delay, which casts serious doubt on the prosecution case. It is further contended that despite the allegations of repeated threats, extortion and payment of money, no complaint was lodged by the de facto complainant or his partners at the relevant point of time. The learned counsel submits that, on the date of registration of the present crime, the petitioner was already in judicial custody in another case and, after securing bail therein, he was re-arrested in the present case with mala fide intention. It is also submitted that the investigation has been completed, no incriminating material has been recovered from the petitioner, and his further custodial detention is unnecessary. The learned counsel further contends that the petitioner is a journalist by profession, has a permanent place of residence, and that mere pendency of other criminal cases, in the absence of any conviction, cannot be a ground to deny bail. The petitioner undertakes to cooperate with the investigation and abide by any conditions that may be

imposed by this Court. Hence, prayed this Court to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed bail contending that petitioner is a habitual offender and a rowdy sheet is also opened against him. Four crimes are pending against the petitioner with similar allegations. The petitioner used to threaten the people and extort money from them under the guise of journalist. He further submitted that if petitioner is released on bail at this stage, he may threaten the witnesses and indulge in similar offences. Hence, prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court notices that the petitioner was initially remanded to judicial custody on 27.05.2026 in Crime No.225 of 2026 and was subsequently secured in the present case through a P.T. warrant, which was regularized on 01.07.2026. Considering the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner, the nature of allegations and the stage of investigation, this Court deems it fit to grant bail to the petitioner. However, the apprehension of the prosecution that the petitioner may influence witnesses or indulge in similar offences can be adequately addressed by

imposing stringent conditions. Hence, petitioner is granted bail 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 Judicial First Class Magistrate at Yellareddy.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the Station House Officer/Investigating Officer concerned on every Monday and Thursday between 11.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. for a period of eight weeks or till filing of charge sheet, whichever is earlier.
- iii. The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly contact, threaten, induce, influence, or intimidate the de facto complainant, witnesses, or any other person acquainted with the facts of the case.
- iv. The petitioner shall not involve himself in any offence of a similar nature during the pendency of case.
- v. The petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required.

- vi. The petitioner shall not leave the State without prior permission of the concerned Court.
- vii. The petitioner shall furnish his residential address and mobile number to the Investigating Officer and shall not change the same without prior intimation to the Investigating Officer.
- viii. In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, it is open to the prosecution to seek cancellation of bail in accordance with law.
- ix. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 483(2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

Date : 21.07.2026  
Rds

---

**K. SUJANA, J**

**THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA**

**CRIMINAL PETITION No.10288 OF 2026**

**DATE : 21.07.2026**

Rds