

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.17385 of 2025

DATE : 29.12.2025

Between:

Sri Mohammed Zeeshan.

...Petitioner/Accused No.2

AND

The State of Telangana
Rep by P.S. Rajendranagar, Through its Public
Prosecutor, High Court of Judicature, at Hyderabad.

...Respondent

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed before this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner who is arrayed as accused No.2 in FIR No.536 of 2025 before the Rajendranagar Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 329(3), 324(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 351(2), r/w 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (for short 'BNS').

2. The case of the prosecution is that the *de-facto* complainant, lodged a report before the police on 16.05.2025 stating that, he is the lawful owner and possessor of Plot No.188, admeasuring 200 Sq.yds situated in S.Y.No.149, Sai Baba Nagar Colony. It is further alleged that the *de-facto* complainant is in the continuous possession of the said plots. On 12.05.2025, accused Nos.5 and 6 along with their henchmen unlawfully entered the land and attempted to take possession of the said plot, and the adjacent plots. The de-facto complainant came to know that the petitioner herein had fraudulently obtained a Registered Agreement of Sale cum General Power of Attorney ('AGPA') bearing No.3651/2010 dated 24.12.2010 from B. Sathi Reddy and B. Papi Reddy and on the basis of the same, they brought into existence a registered sale deed bearing No.582/2025 dated 08.01.2025 in favour of Mohammed Asifuddin and Shabad Tajuddin and further stated that the said documents are suspicious in nature, as such requested the police for taking necessary action. On receipt of the said complaint, the Police registered case against the petitioner for the offences as alleged. Aggrieved thereby, this

Criminal Petition is filed seeking anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

3. Heard Sri B. Pavan, learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Sri Arun Kumar Doddla, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent - State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the said allegations and there are no such allegations against the petitioner to constitute any of the alleged offence. In fact, the petitioner herein along with other persons had obtained a registered AGPA in the year, 2010. Even according to the *de-facto* complainant, accused Nos.7 and 8 had no title over the subject property and had executed the said document in favour of the petitioner, pursuant to which the petitioner executed a sale deed in favour of accused Nos.1 and 6. It is further submitted that there is no such fabrication of any false document by the petitioner and that the entire dispute, if any, pertains to the title of accused Nos.7 and 8 and their vendors, therefore, the allegations are nothing but civil in nature and instead of availing appropriate civil remedies, the de-

facto complainant has filed a false criminal case implicating this petitioner. The petitioner is ready to cooperate with the investigation and no custodial interrogation is required in the present case. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, contending that the allegations against the petitioner are of a serious and grievous nature. It is further submitted that under the guise of AGPA, the petitioner and other accused executed sale transactions in the year, 2025, thereby unsettling the possession of the de-facto complainant. It is further submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. At this stage, granting of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner does not arise. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the petitioner herein is arrayed as accused No.2

and even according to the *de-facto* complainant, the petitioner, along with others, obtained a registered Agreement of Sale-cum-General Power of Attorney in the year 2010, which was executed by accused Nos.7 and 8. Further, as the investigation is based on the documentary evidence, interrogation is not required. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court deems it fit to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner, subject to compliance of the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Rajendranagar Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release him on bail, on petitioner executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only), with two sureties, for the like sum each.
- ii. The petitioner shall abide by the other conditions stipulated in Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and co-operate with the

Investigating Officer in investigating the case.

- iii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned Investigating Officer on every Monday between 09:00 a.m, and 05:00 p.m., till the filing of the charge sheet and thereafter, as and when required.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 29.12.2025
SRK

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.17385 of 2025

Date: 29.12.2025

SRK