

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10969 OF 2026

DATE : 21.07.2026

Between:

Mettela Ramesh

...Petitioner

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 accused No.3 in FIR No.1014 of 2026 of Cybercrimes Police Station, Cyberabad, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 336(2), 338, 340(2) read with 3(5) of *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita*, 2023 (for short, "BNS") and Section 66-D of *Information Technology Act*, 2000 (for short, "IT Act").

3. Heard Ms.Vangala Niharika Goud, learned counsel representing Mr.Pattem Venkateswarlu, learned counsel for the petitioner and

Mr.M.Vivekananda Reddy, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor representing the respondent-State.

4. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the de facto complainant approached accused No.1 in February, 2026 for assistance in securing employment as a Data Analyst in a software company. It is alleged that, at the instance of accused No.1, the de facto complainant paid certain amounts on the assurance that suitable employment would be secured. During the course of investigation, the name of the present petitioner allegedly surfaced on the basis of the confessional statement of accused No.4. On the strength of the report lodged by the de facto complainant and the material collected during the investigation, the present crime came to be registered for the offences alleged.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present crime. It is contended that neither the allegations in the complaint nor the material collected during the investigation disclose any promise made by the petitioner regarding employment, any participation by him in the alleged recruitment process, or receipt of any amount from the de facto complainant. It is further submitted that the petitioner's name does not find place in the complaint or in any of the alleged monetary transactions. According to the learned counsel, the petitioner's implication rests solely

upon the alleged confessional statement of accused No.4, which, by itself, does not disclose any specific overt act attributable to the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence. It is further submitted that the evidentiary value and admissibility of such statement are matters to be examined during the course of investigation and, if necessary, at the stage of trial. Nevertheless, the petitioner expresses his willingness to cooperate with the investigating agency and undertakes to appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required, besides faithfully complying with any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. On the aforesaid grounds, learned counsel prays that the petitioner be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

6. Per contra, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor opposed the petition, contending that the petitioner was actively associated with accused No.4 in the commission of the alleged offences and was involved in similar fraudulent activities. It is further submitted that the petitioner has not made himself available for investigation and that his custodial interrogation is necessary to ascertain the complete modus operandi adopted by the accused persons, to trace the flow of funds, identify other victims, if any, and to unearth the larger conspiracy, if involved. It is, therefore, contended that grant of anticipatory bail at this stage may impede the ongoing investigation and adversely affect the collection of

evidence. On the above grounds, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor prayed for dismissal of the petition.

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

8. The gravamen of the allegations, as borne out from the complaint and the material collected during the course of investigation, is that the accused persons, acting in concert, induced the de facto complainant to part with certain amounts on the false representation that they would secure employment for him as a Data Analyst in a software company. It is alleged that, after receiving the amounts, the accused failed to provide the promised employment.

9. A careful perusal of the material placed before this Court indicates that the petitioner's name has surfaced during the investigation primarily on the basis of the alleged confessional statement of accused No.4. Prima facie, the reference made therein appears to relate to certain monetary transactions between the petitioner and accused No.4. However, at this stage, there is no substantive material placed before this Court demonstrating the petitioner's direct participation either in inducing the de facto complainant to part with money or in making any representation regarding employment. Whether the petitioner had any active role in the

alleged conspiracy, the nature and extent of his involvement, and the evidentiary value of the material collected by the investigating agency are matters which necessarily require a thorough investigation and cannot be conclusively adjudicated at the stage of consideration of an application for anticipatory bail.

10. The principles governing the exercise of jurisdiction are now well settled. In *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 SCC 565, the Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the power to grant anticipatory bail is an extraordinary but salutary power intended to protect the fundamental right to personal liberty and that such power must be exercised judiciously, depending upon the facts and circumstances of each case. Likewise, in *Armesh Kumar v. State of Bihar*, (2014) 8 SCC 273, the Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasised that arrest should not be resorted to as a matter of routine and that the investigating agency must satisfy itself regarding the necessity for custodial interrogation before curtailing the liberty of an accused.

11. Applying the aforesaid principles to the facts of the present case, this Court finds that the allegations against the petitioner presently rest substantially upon the statement attributed to co-accused No.4, and the material presently available does not disclose any specific overt act or direct inducement attributable to the petitioner. The petitioner has

expressed his willingness to cooperate with the investigation and has undertaken to appear before the Investigating Officer whenever required. Further, no material has been placed before this Court to indicate that the petitioner is likely to abscond, tamper with the prosecution evidence, or influence witnesses. The prosecution has also not demonstrated any compelling or exceptional circumstance warranting custodial interrogation of the petitioner at this stage.

12. In the considered opinion of this Court, the interests of the investigation can be adequately safeguarded by imposing appropriate conditions securing the petitioner's presence and cooperation during the course of investigation. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction by extending the relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to appropriate conditions ensuring his availability to the investigating agency and protecting the interests of the prosecution.

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

(A). The petitioner No.3/Accused No.3 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Cyber Crimes Police Station, Cyberabad, on or before 04.08.2026. Upon such surrender or in the event of arrest the Station House Officer shall release the

petitioner on bail on execution of 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 said Officer.

(B) The petitioner shall appear before the Investigating officer on every Tuesday between 09.00AM to 05.00PM, for a period of eight (08) weeks from the date of his release on bail and shall cooperate with the investigation in all respects.

(C) The petitioner shall remain available for interrogation as and when required during the course of investigation and shall extend full cooperation to the investigation.

(D) The petitioner shall furnish his complete residential address, mobile number and other contact particulars to the Investigating Officer and shall promptly intimate any change therein.

(E) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly induce, threaten, influence, or promise any person acquainted with the facts of the case, nor shall he tamper with prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

(F) Any willful breach or violation of any of the aforesaid conditions shall render the petitioners liable to appropriate proceedings before the jurisdictional Court, including cancellation of bail, in accordance with the provisions of the BNSS and other applicable laws.

14. 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: 21.07.2026
CHS

N.TUKARAMJI, J

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10969 OF 2026

DATE : 21.07.2026

CHS