

HON'BLE JUSTICE G. SRI DEVI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.7194 of 2019

ORDER :

This Criminal Petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. is filed by the petitioner/accused, seeking anticipatory bail in Crime No.491 of 2019 on the file of the S.H.O., Hayathnagar Police Station, Rachakonda District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 468 and 471 IPC.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for respondent-State.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not committed any offence, much less the alleged offence and he has been falsely implicated in this case at the behest of some vested interested persons, who are inimically disposed towards the petitioner due to business rivalry. He further submit that the property mentioned in the F.I.R. was initially purchased by P.Manik Reddy, through a registered sale deed, in the year 1991. Thereafter, the petitioner is the bona fide purchaser of plot Nos. 447 and 448, which was purchased from the de facto complainant through a registered sale deed, dated 30.04.2019. On enquiry, the petitioner came to know that the GPA was executed for plot No.448 to M.Damodhar Reddy and he sold it to one Nage Sireesha and in turn, the

said Naga Sireesha sold it to G.Venkateswarlu and as soon as the petitioner came to know that he registered a GPA in his favour on 31.05.2019 from one Venkateswarlu by paying extra amount to avoid litigation. He further submits that the de facto complainant filed this complaint with a mala fide intention and only to harass the petitioner. He further submits that the complainant has not filed her sale deed to substantiate her claim of ownership on the subject plot and hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the State vehemently opposed the bail application by contending that the petitioner has been arrayed as A1 in this case and he had impersonated one lady as the original owner of the schedule property and sold it to third party.

5. There are specific allegations against the petitioner that he has falsely impersonated the de facto complainant and sold the plot belonging to the de facto complainant to third party.

6. Taking into consideration the nature of allegations made against the petitioner and also keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE G. SRI DEVI

DATED: 18.11.2019.

Hsd



