

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4692 of 2026

DATE: 07.04.2026

BETWEEN:

Sayyad Kaleem and another

..... Petitioners/accused
Nos.2 and 3

And

The State of T.G.,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
Through P.S. Vanasthalipuram,
Ranga Reddy District.
(Malkajgiri Commissionerate).

..... Respondent/
Complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed praying this Court to enlarge the petitioners on bail who is arrayed as accused Nos.2 and 3 in Crime No.369 of 2026 of Vanasthalipuram Police Station, Malkajgiri Commissionerate. The offences

alleged against the petitioners are punishable under Sections 338, 336(3), 340(2), 316(2) and 318(4) read with 61(2) of BNS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 28.02.2026, the de-facto complainant lodged a report before the police stating that she had purchased 305 square yards of land in Plot No.246, Survey Nos.327 and 239, situated at Turkayamjal Village, in the year 1984 from (1) Chinna Janga Reddy @ Bokka Jangaiah, Bokka Linga Reddy and Bokka Yadi Reddy, under registered Sale Deed bearing Document No. 1295/1984. Due to a spelling error in her husband's name in the original document, a rectification deed was subsequently executed. The complainant has been occasionally visiting the said plot. However, upon verifying the Encumbrance Certificate (EC) online on 21.02.2026, she noticed that a sale deed bearing Document No.1847/2026, dated 21.02.2026, was registered at the SRO, Vanasthalipuram, showing transfer of 155 square yards of land in favour of Shaik Shareef and 150 square yards in favour of Kothapally Ravindra. It is alleged that one Sayed Kaleem created a false document by falsely representing that the complainant had executed a General Power of Attorney (GPA) in his favour, while claiming that she was residing in

the United States of America, and forged her signatures. Based on such fabricated GPA, the said Sayed Kaleem executed the sale deeds in favour of Shaik Shareef and Kothapally Ravindra. As such, requested the police to take necessary action against them. Basing on the report, the police registered a case against the accused for the abovementioned offences.

3. Heard Sri Veerababu Gandu, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and Sri M.Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent – State

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners, who are arrayed as Accused Nos. 2 and 3, are innocent of the allegations and have been falsely implicated in the present crime and that the petitioners have never been involved in any criminal case and that the police have suppressed material facts and foisted a false case against them. He further submitted that when a person executes a document claiming a property which does not belong to him, he is not impersonating another person nor claiming authorization from the true owner; therefore, such execution

does not amount to the execution of a false document. He contended that the remand case diary clearly indicates that the investigation has been completed and that no further investigation is pending and that the petitioners have been in judicial custody since 05.03.2026, and their further custodial detention is not required in the present case. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioners by allowing this Criminal Petition.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the bail, submitting that the allegations against the petitioners are severe in nature and that the investigation is not yet completed, and releasing the petitioners at this stage would hamper the investigation. Hence prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and a perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the petitioners are in jail since 05.03.2026. As seen from the record, the material part of the investigation has been completed and L.Ws.1 to 8 witnesses have been examined. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the incarceration period of the

petitioners, this Court deems it fit to grant bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioners shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only) each, with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned VII Additional Metropolitan Magistrate, Ranga Reddy District at Hayathnagar.
- ii. The petitioners 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 petitioners 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 applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 07.04.2026
SS

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4692 of 2026

Date: 07.04.2026

SS