

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4807 OF 2026

DATE :06.05.2026

Between:

Smt Kalahasthi Jayanthi

....Petitioner/A.1

AND

The State of Telangana

.....Respondent/Complainant

:ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking the Court to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner/A.1 in the event of her arrest in connection with Crime No.685 of 2025 of Vanasthalipuram Police Station, Rachakonda District. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 420, 406, 467, 468, 471, 120(B) r/w.34 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC').

2. The facts of the case are that on 19.05.2025 at about 1500 hours, the complainant- Toyyeti Venkata Ram Kumar, lodged a complaint stating that he is the GPA holder of Mrs. T. Sunitha Rani @ Sunita Rani Gogineni, who is presently residing in Marietta, Georgia, USA. That the said Sunitha Rani is the absolute owner of Plot No.8, admeasuring 472 square yards in Sy.No.94, situated at Injapur Village, Abdullapurmet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, having purchased the same through a registered sale deed dated 04.04.1997. It is further alleged that she has been residing in the USA for over 25 years and visited India only for short period in 2015–2016 and again in June–July 2024. With an intention to develop the plot, she authorized him to obtain construction permission, and when he visited the property on 12.01.2025, he found a temporary structure with a poultry farm and learnt that the plot had allegedly been sold to one Arella Srikanth. Upon verification of the encumbrance certificate, he discovered that a sale deed dated 29.03.2022 had been executed in favour of the said Srikanth. On obtaining certified copies, it was revealed that one Kalahasthi Jayanthi had impersonated Sunitha Rani, forged her signature, and fraudulently executed the sale deed in favour of Arella Srikanth with the involvement of witnesses G. Sanjeev Reddy and

S.Harish Yadav. The complainant asserted that Sunitha Rani never sold the property to anyone and that all the accused persons acted in furtherance of a common intention to cheat her. He further stated that the said Jayanthi had earlier approached Narsingi Police Station by falsely claiming loss of the original 1997 sale deed and obtained a lost property certificate, thereby indicating a clear act of fraud and fabrication. Hence, requested the police to take necessary action basing on which the present crime is registered.

3. Heard Sri V. Yadu Krishna Sainath, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri M.Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent – State.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in no way connected with the alleged offence and has been falsely implicated by the complainant with baseless allegations. It is further contended that the petitioner is a native of Nellore, Andhra Pradesh, and has no involvement in the present crime, and that there are no specific allegations against her to attract the aforesaid offences, which have been invoked only to circumvent the procedure under Section 41(A) Cr.P.C. It

is also submitted that the petitioner is a law-abiding citizen, and if she is taken into custody, it would cause irreparable damage to her reputation; moreover, the police are making strenuous efforts to arrest her, and there is a reasonable apprehension that she may be subjected to third-degree methods. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has minor children to take care of and petitioner undertakes to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this court and prayed this Court to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed bail contending that the offence committed by the petitioner is a grave offence. As such, petitioner is not entitled to bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, and the material placed on record, this Court observes that although the allegations pertain to a serious offence involving impersonation and fraudulent execution of a sale deed, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions :

- i. The petitioner shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Vanasthalipuram Police Station, Rachakonda District within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release the petitioner on bail on her 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 appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m and 05.00 p.m., on every Monday for a period of eight (8) weeks, for the purpose of investigation or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier and thereafter, as and when required.
 - iii. The petitioner shall abide by the other conditions stipulated in Section 482 (2) of BNSS and co-operate with the Investigating Officer in investigating the case.
7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 06.05.2026
Rds

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.4807 OF 2026

Date: 06.05.2026

Rds