

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10846 of 2026

DATE: 20.07.2026

Between:

Mukara Sumanth

...Petitioner/accused

AND

The State of Telangana,
Through Saroornagar,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court at Hyderabad.

...Respondent/Complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed before this Court for grant of bail to the Petitioner who is arrayed as accused in FIR No.617 of 2026 of Saroornagar Police Station, Malkajgiri District, registered for the offence punishable under Section 69 of the BNS.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 16.06.2026, the de-facto complainant lodged a report before the police stating that the de-facto complainant was married to one Srinivas about 20 years ago and have two children. Due to family disputes, she obtained a divorce from her husband. In 2016, she became acquainted with

the petitioner herein. Taking advantage of their acquaintance, the petitioner allegedly promised to marry her and, on that assurance, maintained a physical relationship with her on several occasions at her residence from 2024 onwards. Due to his involvement, disputes also arose between her and her husband. In 2025, the petitioner repeatedly assured her that he would marry her and, by making such false promises, allegedly took approximately Rs.30 lakhs from her at different times. Since then, he had been residing with her in Saroornagar. Whenever she asked him about marriage, he continued postponing it on one pretext or another. In August 2025, she came to know that the petitioner had already married another woman. When she questioned him, he allegedly stated that he had no interest in her and had remained with her only for money. She then informed his mother and his brother over the phone about the matter, but instead of giving any explanation, they allegedly abused her in filthy language and warned her not to contact the petitioner again, stating that she was already a married woman. On 17-03-2026, the petitioner allegedly came to her house, threatened to kill her if she or her family members contacted him again, assaulted her physically, and left. Thereafter, on 14-06-2026, he allegedly called her once again, threatened her not to contact him, and blocked her phone number. Hence, the complainant requested to take necessary action. Basing on the said complaint, the police registered a case for the above said offences.

3. Heard Sri Mahesh Muddala, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as well as Sri D. Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the said allegations and he is falsely implicated in the present case and whatever the relationship between the parties is a consensual relationship. He further submitted that, during the existence of the first marriage, the de-facto complainant was acquainted with the petitioner herein, which itself shows that there is no such promise of marriage and he is in jail since 17.06.2026 and the material part of the investigation was already completed. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to him by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner stating that the allegations against the petitioner herein are serious and heinous in nature. Further, the investigation is not yet completed and under the guise of marriage, the petitioner herein physically exploited the de-facto complainant, as such, the petitioner is not entitled for the bail. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the petitioner herein is in jail since 17.06.2026. As seen from the remand case diary, the prosecution witnesses, LWs 1 to 12 have already been examined. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations, the stage of investigation, the period of incarceration of the petitioner, this Court finds it appropriate to grant 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 Special Judicial Magistrate of First Class (Excise)-Cum-V Additional Junior Civil Judge-Cum-V Additional Metropolitan Magistrate, Ranga Reddy District, at L.B. Nagar.
- 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).

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Date: 20.07.2026
TU

K. SUJANA, J

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10846 OF 2026

DATE 20.07.2026

TU