

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.14247 OF 2026

(CNR No. HBHC010598612026)

DATE: 09.09.2026

Between :

Sattu Naresh

... Petitioner

AND

The State of Telangana

... 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.9 in Crime No.84 of 2026 on the file of Keesara Police Station, Medchal-Malkajgiri registered for the offences punishable under Sections 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2) of *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023* (for short, 'BNS').

3. Heard Mr.Mekala Santosh Kumar, learned Counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, representing the respondent -State.

4.1. The prosecution case, in brief, is that, the de facto complainant, who is the owner of Plot No. 108, admeasuring 300 square yards, situated in Survey Nos. 404 and 405 of Rampally Village, Keesara Mandal, lodged a complaint stating that he had purchased the said house plot under a registered sale deed in the year 1983. In December 2025, when he visited the Sub-Registrar Office, Keesara, he was surprised to learn that certain sale deeds had been registered in respect of his property on the basis of allegedly false and fabricated documents.

4.2. Upon making further enquiry, it was revealed that, in the year 2023, a sale deed had been executed by relying upon a link document purportedly of the year 1982. The investigation allegedly revealed that Accused No. 1, who was engaged in the real estate business, hatched a plan and, in conspiracy with Accused No. 3, projected himself as the original owner of the property and created fabricated link documents in the year 1982, with the active assistance of Accused Nos. 7 and 8.

4.3. Thereafter, in furtherance of the alleged conspiracy, they are stated to have succeeded in registering a fabricated sale deed in favour of Accused No. 4. Subsequently, Accused No. 4 allegedly executed sale deeds in favour of Accused No. 10, while Accused No. 9 is alleged to have executed a sale deed in the year 2024 in favour of Accused No. 13/GVR Infrastructure. According to the investigating agency, the petitioner's name

figures in the fraudulent chain of transactions relating to the subject property. It is alleged that, in furtherance of the conspiracy, the petitioner received an extent of 150 square yards from Accused No. 4 under a sale deed and subsequently executed a sale deed in favour of Accused No. 13.

5.1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a bona fide purchaser for valuable consideration and has no involvement whatsoever in the alleged conspiracy or fabrication of documents. He submits that the petitioner is a businessman who purchased the subject land and subsequently sold the same to Accused No. 13. According to learned counsel, the petitioner had no role in fabricating the alleged link document or any of the subsequent documents and has been falsely implicated merely because he purchased a portion of the property from Accused No. 4.

5.2. Learned counsel further submits that Accused Nos. 8 to 10, 13, 15 and 16 were arrested and subsequently enlarged on bail, while Accused No. 14 was granted anticipatory bail by this Court. It is further submitted that the petitioner is a permanent resident, is willing to cooperate with the investigation, has no criminal antecedents, and is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by the Court. On these grounds, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

6.1. Per contra, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposes the petition and submits that the de facto complainant had categorically pointed out the fabricated documents created and relied upon to falsely assert title over the subject property. It is further submitted that all the accused, acting pursuant to the alleged conspiracy, created and relied upon the said fabricated documents.

6.2. According to the prosecution, the petitioner/Accused No. 9 played a role in layering the property by incorporating his name into the chain of registration documents. He further submits that the presence of the petitioner may be necessary for custodial interrogation and for conducting an effective investigation. It is contended that, if anticipatory bail is granted, there is a possibility that the petitioner may not cooperate with the investigation. Accordingly, learned Additional Public Prosecutor prays for dismissal of the petition.

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

8. It is well settled that the jurisdiction under Section 482 of the BNSS, is intended to balance the individual's right to personal liberty with the legitimate requirements of a fair and effective investigation. While considering an application for anticipatory bail, the Court is required to

consider the nature and gravity of the accusation, the specific role attributed to the accused, his antecedents, the likelihood of his fleeing from justice or tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses, and the necessity of custodial interrogation. Further, at this stage, the Court is not required to undertake a meticulous appreciation of the prosecution material or adjudicate disputed questions of fact. A prima facie assessment is sufficient for determining whether custodial arrest is warranted, while keeping in view the seriousness of the allegations and the legitimate requirements of investigation.

9. In the present case, the principal allegation against the petitioner is that he participated in the alleged layering of the de facto complainant's property by having 150 square yards registered in his favour and thereafter executing a sale deed in favour of Accused No. 13. It is not in dispute that Accused No. 4 executed a registered sale deed in favour of the petitioner. According to the prosecution, however, Accused No. 4, in concert with the other accused, had earlier created fabricated link documents purportedly of the year 1982 and, on the strength thereof, secured registration of a sale deed in his favour.

10. At this stage, there is no prima facie material demonstrating the petitioner's direct involvement in the creation or fabrication of the said link documents. His alleged role arises from the subsequent transactions with

Accused No. 4 and Accused No. 13. Whether the petitioner had knowledge of the antecedent fraud, acted in furtherance of the alleged conspiracy, or thereby committed the alleged offences are matters for investigation and cannot be conclusively determined at this stage.

11. Having regard to the nature of the allegations, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, the fact that the transactions are evidenced by registered documents, and the absence of prima facie material showing his direct involvement in fabrication of the documents, and the expressed willingness of the petitioner to cooperate with the investigation, and there is no material indicating that he is likely to abscond, evade the process of law, tamper with evidence, or influence witnesses and particularly as no specific circumstance has been demonstrated warranting his custodial interrogation, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to appropriate conditions.

12. For the aforesaid reasons, this Criminal Petition is allowed, subject to following conditions.

(A) The petitioner/Accused No.9 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Keesara Police Station, Medchal-Malkajgiri on or before 24.09.2026. Upon such surrender or in the event of arrest the Station House Officer shall release him 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 and Saturday between 10.00AM to 03.00PM, for a period of twelve (12) weeks from the date of his 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 his 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 he 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.

Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

Date: 09.09.2026
CHS

N.TUKARAMJI, J

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.14247 OF 2026

DATE: 09.09.2026

CHS