

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No. 15707 of 2025

DATE: 10.12.2025

Between:

Nenavath Kishan

.... Petitioner/Accused No.2

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court at Hyderabad.
(Through SHO, P.S. Maheshwaram)

.... Respondent/Complainant

ORDER

This criminal petition is filed under Section 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner/Accused No.2 seeking enlargement on bail in connection with Crime No.435 of 2025 of Maheshwaram Police Station, Rachakonda Commissionerate. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 111(1), 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(4), 340(1), 340(2), 31(2) read with 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS).

2. The brief facts of the case are that, on 12.11.2025, the *de-facto* complainant lodged a report with the police stating that his brother, presently residing abroad, owns agricultural land admeasuring Ac.9.04 guntas in Sy.No.247/5 of Thummaloor Village, Maheshwaram Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. The land was not updated in the Land Records Updating Program (LRUP) during the Dharani process and remained pending for Digital Signature in the revenue records. In July 2025, when his brother visited India, he approached the MRO Office, Maheshwaram, for updating the Digital Signature. After 15 days, he left abroad, and later, on verifying the status online, found that a slot had been booked for the sale of the land. He immediately informed the complainant, who, upon verification at the MRO Office, discovered that a fabricated Pattadar Passbook had been issued in the name of his brother using a different Aadhaar number. Further inquiry revealed that Kishan Naik, Srikanth Naik, and Chukka Srikanth Goud, in collusion with certain Revenue Officials, had created a fake Aadhaar card by impersonating his brother with one Pandula Davalaiah, completed the Digital Signature process at a Mee Seva Centre, obtained the Pattadar Passbook, and booked a registration slot (Application No. 2500158893) to sell the land without consent. Consequently, the complainant approached the police, seeking necessary action. Based on the said complaint, the police

registered a case against the petitioner and other accused for the aforementioned offences.

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

4. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner is innocent of the allegations and has been falsely implicated and that the petitioner is a real estate businessman and a *bona fide* purchaser of land in Sy.Nos.247/A3, 247/RU2, and 247/LU11/2, for which he paid consideration of Rs.4.9 crores, with a balance of Rs.1.6 crores payable on or before 30.01.2025 to the persons in possession. The petitioner/A.2 paid Rs.2.5 crores to A.1 under a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), yet he has been wrongly arrayed as accused No.2, though the complaint pertains only to land in Sy.No.247/5, with which he has no connection. He further submitted that A.1 and A.3 provided the Aadhaar card and Pattadar Passbook of A.3 by impersonating the original owners, and after thorough verification of the documents, including the Pattadar Passbook, Aadhaar card, and Dharani portal, the petitioner/A.2 believed the transaction to be genuine. Therefore, he has no role in the alleged fabrication of documents. The petitioner has been in judicial custody since

14.11.2025, and the material part of the investigation, which is based on documentary evidence, has already been completed. Hence, prayed this Court to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, contending that the petitioner is a habitual offender against whom a rowdy sheet was opened in 2013 and has since been renewed 10 to 12 times, and is still pending. He further submitted that the petitioner is not a *bona fide* purchaser, but conspired with the other accused and entered into a MoU for purchasing the land without paying any consideration, knowingly participating in the said transaction. As the investigation is still at an initial stage, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon a perusal of the material available on record, it is noted that the learned Additional Public Prosecutor contends that the petitioner is a habitual offender and that a rowdy sheet is pending against him. Conversely, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the alleged offences are of the year 2013, and thereafter the petitioner has had no knowledge of whether the said

rowdy sheet is pending or renewed, nor has any notice been issued to him in that regard. Apart from the present allegations under Section 111(1) of the BNS, there are previous charge sheets pending against the petitioner and that he has been convicted in C.C. Nos.1352/2019 and 217/2021. It is further observed that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 14.11.2025 and, as per the remand case diary, prosecution witnesses L.Ws.1 to 13, including the investigating officer, have already been examined. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the stage of investigation, and the period of incarceration, this Court finds it appropriate to grant bail to the petitioner/Accused No.2, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner-accused No.2 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 XVII Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Maheshwaram, Ranga Reddy District.
- ii. The petitioner-accused No.2 shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 a.m., on every Monday for a period of eight (8) week or till filing of charge sheet whichever

is earlier, for the purpose of investigation,
and thereafter, as and when required.

- iii. The petitioner-accused No.2 shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C. (presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

Date: 10.12.2025
SS

K. SUJANA, J

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.15707 OF 2025

DATE :10.12.2025

SS