

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos. 17379 of 2025

DATE: 23.12.2025

Between:

Sri Bandi Madhavulu Madhu

.... Petitioner/Accused No.8

AND

The State of Telangana,

Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,

High Court at Hyderabad, (Through SHO, P.S. Maheshwaram

Rachakonda Commissionerate Ranga Reddy district)

.... 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.8 seeking to grant 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), 61(2) read with 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS).

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 12.11.2025, a complaint had been lodged by Ramidi Ramakanth Reddy stating that agricultural land belonging to his brother was fraudulently interfered with. He had discovered that a fabricated Pattadar Passbook and a fake Aadhaar card were created in his brother's name using impersonation, and that a registration slot was booked to sell the land without consent. He alleged that accused persons, in collusion with revenue officials, had forged land documents and digital signatures.

3. Heard Sri M. Ram Mohan Reddy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri D. Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that no specific allegations or overt acts had been attributed to the petitioner either in the complaint or in the remand case diary. He further submitted that none of the ingredients as alleged in the complaint were made out, as there was no assertion that the petitioner forged signatures, created false documents, or acted with common intention. He contended that the investigation was substantially completed by the time of remand of the co-accused, and the petitioner was neither required for custodial interrogation nor shown to have conspired with others. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioner by allowing this Criminal Petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner stating that the allegations leveled against the petitioner are serious and heinous in nature. Further, the investigation was not yet completed. Therefore, at this stage, granting of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner does not arise. Hence, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon a careful perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the main allegation against the petitioner is that he is one of the accused in the alleged fraudulent attempt to deal with the subject agricultural land. As seen from the record, no specific overt act has been attributed to the petitioner either in the complaint or in the remand case diary. There is no material placed on record to show that the petitioner had forged any documents, impersonated the land owner, created false digital records, or actively participated in the alleged transaction with the requisite common intention. Further, accused No.2 was arrested and subsequently enlarged on bail by this Court. As seen from the record, the material part of the investigation has already been completed and the role attributed to the petitioner does not warrant custodial interrogation at this stage. Therefore,

considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court deems it fit to grant bail to the petitioner/accused No.8, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner-accused No.8 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.8 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.8 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.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 23.12.2025
SRK

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.17379 OF 2025

DATE :23.12.2025

SRK