

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

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8810 of 2026

DATE: 25.06.2026

Between:

Pathikayala Venkata Satyasainadh

.... Petitioner/Accused No.2

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court at Hyderabad,
Through SHO, P.S. Dundigal, Cyberabad.

.... Respondent/Complainant

: ORDER :

This criminal petition is filed under Sections 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 by the petitioner-accused No.2 praying to enlarge him on bail in connection with Crime No.503 of 2026 of Dundigal Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 338, 336(3), 316(2), 318(4) r/w 3(5) of the BNS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the *de-facto* complainant lodged a complaint before police stating that the

petitioner, without any right or authority, collected money from the agreement holders and that there existed an agreement between the *de-facto* complainant and the builders, which specifically contained a clause prohibiting the petitioner, the other accused and their partners from receiving any amount from prospective purchasers. Despite the said restriction, the petitioner, in furtherance of a criminal conspiracy with the other accused, allegedly collected huge amounts of cash, totalling Rs.81,50,000/-, from about six customers without any authorization, knowledge, or consent of either the builder or the de-facto complainant. By such acts, the petitioner committed criminal breach of trust and cheating. Therefore, the *de-facto* complainant requested the police to take necessary action against the accused persons. Based on the said complaint, the police registered a case for the aforesaid offences.

3. Heard Sri C. Lalith Kumar Reddy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri D. Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is innocent and that the *de-facto* complainant has no locus standi to lodge the present complaint and that the

petitioner is also a partner along with the *de-facto* complainant under the said agreement and that the prospective purchasers have already entered into agreements with the builders and have no grievance against the petitioner. He further submitted that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 11.06.2026 and that the investigation has been substantially completed. Learned counsel also submitted that the custody petition filed by the prosecution was dismissed and that Accused No.1 has already been granted bail by the trial Court. Hence, he prayed this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the grant of bail, contending that the offence committed by the petitioner is grave and serious in nature and that a huge amount is involved in the present case and that the investigation is still at an initial stage. Therefore, at this stage, the petitioner is not entitled to be released on bail. Hence, he prayed that this Court dismiss the present petition.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the *de-facto* complainant submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are very serious in nature, as an amount of about

Rs.81,00,000/- is involved in the case. He further submitted that the acts of the petitioner have not only caused financial loss but have also resulted in the *de-facto* complainant losing his goodwill and reputation with the builders. He contended that further investigation is required for the recovery of the proceeds of crime. Therefore, prayed the Court to dismiss this Criminal Petition.

7. Having considered the rival submissions and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is evident that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 11.06.2026. As per the remand case diary, prosecution witnesses, namely LWs.1 to 10, have already been examined. Taking into consideration the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the progress of the investigation, the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner and the fact that Accused No.1 has already been granted bail by the trial Court, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner 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 VIII Additional

Judicial Magistrate of First Class, at
Medchal.

- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m., on every Wednesday 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.
- iii. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 483(2) of the BNSS.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 25.06.2026
SS

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.8810 of 2026

Date: 25.06.2026

SS