

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.9122 OF 2026

DATE : 01.07.2026

Between :

P.Durga Prasad

... Petitioner/AO

And

The State of Telangana

... Respondent/Complainant

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 by the petitioner praying this Court to enlarge him on bail who is accused in C.C.No.4 of 2019 on the file of Principal Special Judge for CBI Cases at Nampally, Hyderabad. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 409, 420, 468, 471 and 477(a) of Indian Penal Code r/w. Section 13(2), 13(1)(c) and 13(1)(d) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner, the defacto complainant who is the Regional Manager of Andhra Pradesh Grameena Vikas Bank, Isnapur Branch, Hyderabad, lodged a complaint stating that the petitioner while working as Field Officer allegedly entered into a criminal conspiracy with the then Branch Managers, Sri S.V. Ramana Murthy and Sri A. Prabhakar, and others during the year 2016-17 to sanction several fictitious housing loans in the names of existing borrowers. It is alleged that the loan amounts were initially credited to the savings bank accounts of the borrowers and were thereafter fraudulently withdrawn without their knowledge by using pre-signed debit vouchers and transferred to the petitioner's personal bank accounts, thereby misappropriating bank funds to the tune of Rs.5.24 crore. It is further alleged that the accused falsified bank records, used forged documents as genuine, committed criminal breach of trust, cheated the bank, and abused their official position, causing wrongful loss to the bank and corresponding wrongful gain to themselves. After investigation, the CBI filed a charge sheet against the petitioner in Calendar Case No.4 of 2019, pending before the Principal Special Judge for CBI Cases, Hyderabad, for the alleged offences.

3. Heard Sri S.Ram Reddy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri T.Srujan Kumar Reddy, learned Special Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and was arrested by the CBI on 26.11.2025, following which he was remanded to judicial custody, where he continues to remain. He also contended that, after filing of the charge sheet, the petitioner regularly appeared before the trial Court until 31.08.2021, but could not appear thereafter due to health issues, resulting in issuance of a Non-Bailable Warrant. It is also contended that the trial has substantially progressed, as 20 witnesses out of 27 have already been examined. The petitioner undertakes to appear before the trial Court on every date of hearing, and there is no likelihood of his absconding. He further contended that if petitioner is not granted bail, it will cause prejudice to him as voluminous document which is to be confronted while cross-examining the official witnesses and trial is at the fag end and those witnesses are crucial. If the cross-examination is not done properly it will affect the case of the petitioner. Hence, prayed this Court to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, the learned Special Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed bail contending that if bail is granted to the petitioner, there is no guarantee that he will appear before the trial Court. Because of the petitioner, the matter was pending from 2019 and NBW was issued in 2021 and with great difficulty the petitioner was arrested on 26.11.2025. As such, petitioner is not entitled to bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Having regard to the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Special Public Prosecutor, and the material available on record, this Court finds that the principal apprehension expressed by the learned Special Public Prosecutor is that, if enlarged on bail, the petitioner may not appear before the trial Court for conclusion of the trial. Admittedly, the record discloses that the petitioner had remained absent before the trial Court, and no steps have been taken by him for recalling the Non-Bailable Warrant (NBW) issued against him. It is also evident that the trial has reached an advanced stage, as the trial Court has already examined 20 out of the 27 witnesses, and the remaining witnesses are stated to be material and crucial to the prosecution case. Having

regard to the stage of trial, in order to give fair opportunity, for expeditious completion of trial, this Court is inclined to grant 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 local sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the Principal Special Judge for CBI Cases at Nampally, Hyderabad.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date of hearing without fail until the conclusion of trial.
- iii. The petitioner shall not file any application seeking dispensation of his personal appearance before the trial Court on any date of hearing.
- iv. The petitioner shall cooperate with the trial proceedings and shall not, directly or indirectly, influence or threaten the witnesses or tamper with the prosecution evidence.
- v. The petitioner is also directed to appear before the investigating officer on every Monday between 11.00 a.m., and 5.00 p.m., till completion of C.C.No.4 of 2019 on the file

of Principal Special Judge for CBI Cases at
Nampally, Hyderabad

vi. In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, it is open to the prosecution to seek cancellation of bail granted to the petitioner in accordance with law.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

Date :01.07.2026
Rds

K. SUJANA, J

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.9122 OF 2026

DATE : 01.07.2026

Rds