IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.16294 OF 2026

(CNR No.HBHC010679662026)

DATE: 13.10.2026

Between :

Mr.Bollineni Vijay Krishna

... Petitioner-accused.

AND

The State of Telangana,
Through SHO Hayathnagar, Rachakonda,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
at Hyderabad.

... Respondent

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023* (for short, 'BNSS'), seeking the relief of pre-arrest bail.

2. The petitioner is arrayed as accused No.4 in Crime No.1126 of 2025 on the file of the Hayathnagar Police Station, Rachakonda District, facing accusations under Section 420, 419, 467, 468, 471 read with Section 34 of *the Indian Penal Code, 1860.*

3. Heard Mr.Mallareddygari Harthika, learned Counsel for the petitioner, and Mr.Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, representing the respondent-State.

4. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the *de-facto* complainant lodged a complaint on 03.08.2025, stating that she is the owner and possessor of an open plot bearing No.42, admeasuring 200 square yards, in Sy.No.157, situated at Bagh Hayathanagar Village, Ward No.4, Block No.8, within the jurisdiction of Hayathanagar Revenue Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. She purchased the said property for valid sale consideration under a registered sale deed bearing Document No.3425 of 1997, dated 15.09.1997. Thereafter, she went to the UAE for employment and upon the death of her husband on 20.05.2011, returned to India. Due to family disputes, personal losses and her relocation, the *de-facto* complainant decided to dispose of her immovable assets. She obtained a copy of the encumbrance certificate, upon examining which she discovered fraudulent transactions recorded in the relevant records. The entries in the records revealed that an Agreement of Sale-cum-General Power of Attorney, dated 08.06.2018, had allegedly been fraudulently executed by Santhoshamma Mangalapati/accused No.1 in favour of accused No.2 by using a fabricated document. On the strength of the said document, a sale deed was subsequently executed in favour of third parties. Based on the said allegations, the crime came to be registered. However, during the course of the investigation, the complainant stated

that the original document/sale deed had been given to the petitioner/accused No.4, who is the brother-in-law of the *de-facto* complainant and that the alleged creation of the document had been carried out at his instance. It has been asserted that, even on the face value of the allegations, the essential ingredients of the alleged offences are not made out. The forensic examination reports pertaining to the alleged documents reportedly reveal impersonation and refer to the thumb impression of accused No.1, with the document being found identical to the specimen left thumb impression.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has no connection whatsoever with the alleged incident and has been falsely implicated in the case. He further pointed out that, as per the averments in the complaint, the document/records were misplaced. However, for the reasons best known to the complainant, the case has been registered based on her statement to the police and said allegation has no substance for supporting the material. Nonetheless, the alleged transactions pertain to the immovable property and all the events based on the registered documents, which can be examined by the investigating agency without the custodial presence of the petitioner. Further it is also pleaded that the petitioner is suffering from serious neurological disorder/paralysis, is permanently confined to a wheel chair and is wholly dependent upon a helper for his day to day activities. Nonetheless, learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to

cooperate with the investigation. In view of the same, and contending that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary, learned counsel prays that the petitioner be granted anticipatory bail.

6. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that there are specific allegations against the petitioner, who is a close relative of the *de-facto* complainant. He pleads that as per the complaint, the original documents were given to the petitioner/accused No.4 for safe custody, based on which the petitioner by employing other accused transferred and created the document by impersonating the document. He further submitted that the investigation is under way, the presence of the petitioner for custodial investigation is required for effective investigation in granting of anticipatory bail at this stage may result in non cooperation of the petitioner for the investigation. Hence, prayed to dismiss the criminal petition. However, learned Additional Public Prosecutor admits that the petitioner/accused No.4 is suffering from neurological disorder/paralysis.

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

8. The specific allegation against the petitioner is that he conspired with the other accused, created documents by impersonating the *de-facto* complainant and thereafter created third party interest through registered sale deed. It is settled position of law that, at this stage of

considering anticipatory bail, this Court is not ordinarily expected to undertake a meticulous examination of the truthfulness of the allegations or to record definitive findings on the questions of fact or law. However, the nature of offence, the allegations against the petitioner/accused No.4, his availability for the investigation, judicial process and genuine requirement for custodial interrogation are relevant considerations. In the instant case, the allegation pertains to creation of registered sale deed by impersonating the complainant. However, from the material on record, except the statement of *de-facto* complaint as to the petitioner's involvement, no other material was brought for his presence in forging/creating the document and to mock away the property. At this stage drawing conclusion would be premature. Having regard to these aspects, the petitioner is willing to cooperate with the investigation and considering his health condition and the fact that the investigation is mainly based on the documentary evidence, this Court is of the considered view that the prayer of the petitioner deserves positive consideration; however, subject to certain conditions to secure the cooperation of the petitioner with the investigation.

9. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed, subject to following conditions.

(A) The petitioner/accused shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Hayathnagar Police Station, Rachakonda District, on or before 27.10.2026. Upon such surrender or in the event of arrest the Station

House Officer shall release them 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 as and when required, for a period of eight (08) weeks from the date of their release on bail or until the filing of the final result, whichever is earlier.

(C) The petitioner shall remain available for investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer and shall cooperate fully with the investigation.

(D) The petitioner shall furnish their complete residential address and contact details to the Investigating Officer and shall keep the same updated throughout the course of investigation.

(E) The petitioner shall not either directly or indirectly induce, threaten, influence, or contact any prosecution witness, nor shall they tamper with the prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

(F) The petitioner shall strictly comply with all the conditions contemplated under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

(G) Any wilful breach or violation of any of the aforesaid conditions shall render the petitioner liable to appropriate proceedings before the court below, including cancellation of bail, in accordance with the provisions of the BNSS and other applicable law.

10. 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.

N.TUKARAMJI, J

Date: 13.10.2026
EDS

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.16294 OF 2026

DATE: 13.10.2026

EDS