

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4216 of 2026

DATE: 07.04.2026

BETWEEN:

Doraivijay Raj and another

.....Petitioners/Accused

And

The State of Telangana,
Represented through its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
Hyderabad.

.....Respondent

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of pre-
arrest bail to the petitioners, who are not yet arrayed as accused in
Crime No.104 of 2025 before the Central Crime Station Police
Station, Hyderabad. The offences alleged in the said crime
are punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2)
read with 61(2) of BNS.

2. Heard Sri Bala Krishna Mandapati, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, and Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent No.1–State.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the present petition has been filed apprehending arrest of the petitioners and though no case has been registered against them, the respondent issued a notice dated 02.03.2026 erroneously identifying the petitioners as “Directors”, whereas the GST Registration Certificate and the Partnership Deed clearly establish that the entity is a partnership firm and the petitioners are only partners and that the business operations were being handled by one Vinod, thereby corroborating that the petitioners were not involved in the day-to-day affairs of the firm. He contended that the alleged fraud is stated to have commenced in the year 2021, whereas the petitioner firm was constituted and registered under GST only in April/May 2024, thereby ruling out any possible involvement of the petitioners in the alleged fraud. He further contended that petitioner No.2 is a woman and is entitled to protection under the proviso to Section 480 of the BNSS and that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents. Hence, he prayed

the Court to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioners by allowing the present Criminal Petition.

4. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the petition and filed a counter affidavit denying the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners contending that the petitioners transferred an amount of Rs.88 lakhs on 30.07.2024, Rs.1 crore on 12.03.2025, and Rs.3 crores on 13.03.2025 to the account of M/s,.Srinivasa Garments, which is owned by Maddipati Srinivas Durga Prasad, the brother of accused No.1. However, no materials were supplied to the complainant company. He further contended that petitioner Nos.1 and 2, in collusion with accused Nos.1 to 3 and 6, generated and forwarded fake invoices to the complainant under the guise of supplying materials. Believing the same to be genuine, the complainant transferred the amounts. However, no goods were supplied, and the amounts received were dishonestly diverted to the bank accounts of accused No.1 and M/s Srinivasa Garments. Thus, a prima facie case is made out against the petitioners. He submitted that, a notice under Sections 94 and 179 of the BNSS was issued to petitioner No.1 on 02.03.2026, directing him to appear before the Investigating Officer for the purpose of enquiry and to verify his complicity in the case. However, instead of

appearing before the Investigating Officer, the petitioners approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of the Criminal Petition.

5. In light of the submissions made by both learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is evident that as on date, the petitioners are not arrayed as accused. However, the counter filed by the Investigating Officer indicates that the petitioners are alleged to be involved in the crime in conspiracy with accused Nos.1 to 3. Though a notice has been issued to the petitioners to appear before the Investigating Officer as witnesses, the averments in the counter disclose allegations against them as well. It is further noted that petitioner No.2 is the wife of petitioner No.1 and is also shown as a partner in the firm, and both the petitioners are partners in the said firm. Considering the nature of the allegations, the fact that the investigation is primarily based on documentary evidence, and the overall circumstances of the case, this Court deems it fit to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioners shall appear before the concerned Investigating Officer in response to the notice issued under Sections 94 and 179 of the BNSS.

- ii. In the event of arrest, the petitioners shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Central Crime Station, Hyderabad, within two (2) weeks from the date of arrest, and upon such surrender, the Station House Officer shall release them on bail on executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/- each with two sureties, for the like sum each.
- iii. In the event of arrest, the petitioners 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.
- iv. In the event of arrest, the petitioners shall appear before the concerned Investigating Officer on every Wednesday between 09:00 a.m, and 05:00 p.m. for a period of eight (8) weeks or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier, for the purpose of investigation, and thereafter, as and when required.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 07.04.2026
SS

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4216of 2026

Date: 07.04.2026
SS