

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.11154 of 2026

DATE: 20.07.2026

Between:

Nakka Kurumurthy

.... Petitioner/Accused

AND

The State of Telangana
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Telangana, Hyderabad,
(Cr.No.37 of 2026, Police Station Srirangapur,
Wanaparthi District).

.... Respondent/Complainant

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed under Sections 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 by the petitioner-accused praying to enlarge him on bail in connection with Cr.No.37 of 2026 of Sri Rangapur Police Station, Wanaparthi. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Section 69 of BNS Act.

2. The brief facts of the case are that, on 18.06.2025, the de facto complainant, a third-year GNM student, lodged a complaint

stating that she became acquainted with the accused, Nakka Kurumurthy, through Instagram about two years earlier. The accused expressed his love, repeatedly assured her that he would marry her, and gained her trust. Believing his promise of marriage, she accepted his proposal. Thereafter, the accused allegedly established physical relations with her on several occasions, beginning in November 2024, on the assurance that they would marry. Their engagement was conducted on 08.06.2025 with the consent of both families. However, despite the engagement, the accused later informed the complainant that he would not marry her and intended to marry another girl. Alleging that the accused had induced her into a physical relationship by making a false promise of marriage and subsequently cheated her by refusing to marry her, she lodged the present complaint seeking legal action against him. Based on these allegations, the FIR was registered for the above-mentioned offences.

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

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated. It is submitted that the relationship between the petitioner and the de

facto complainant was consensual and continued for a considerable period. The physical relationship was with the free consent of the complainant and not on account of any false promise of marriage. It is further contended that the engagement between the parties was solemnized with the consent of both families, which clearly indicates that the petitioner had a genuine intention to marry the complainant. However, due to subsequent circumstances, the marriage could not be solemnized. It is submitted that a subsequent refusal to marry, by itself, would not attract the offences alleged, and therefore he prayed this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail by allowing this Criminal Petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the petition and contended that the allegations in the complaint disclose the commission of cognizable offences. It is submitted that the petitioner induced the de facto complainant to enter into a physical relationship by repeatedly assuring her that he would marry her. Believing such assurances, the complainant consented to the physical relationship. Though the engagement between the parties was performed, the petitioner subsequently refused to marry the complainant and expressed his intention to marry another girl. It is contended that the allegations require a thorough investigation to ascertain whether the promise of

marriage was false from the inception and whether the consent of the complainant was obtained on the basis of such promise. Therefore, at this stage, it is not a fit case for granting the relief sought. Further, he contended that, at this stage, the petitioner is not entitled to be released on bail and prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is evident that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 20.06.2026. The record further reveals that the material witnesses have been examined. Taking into consideration the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the progress of the investigation and the period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant regular 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 Principal Judicial First Class Magistrate at Wanaparthy.
- 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, 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, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 20.07.2026

pl

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.11154 of 2026

Date: 20.07.2026

pl