IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No. 15847 OF 2026

(CNR No. HBHC010666552026)

DATE: 05.10.2026

Between :

Parvathi Ravi Kumar and three others.

… Petitioners/Accused Nos. 1 to 4

AND

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

… Respondent.

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of the *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023* (for short, "BNSS"), seeking the relief of pre-arrest bail.

2. The petitioners are arrayed as Accused Nos. 1 to 4 in Crime No. 249 of 2025 of Yedapally Police Station, Nizamabad District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 212, 319, 335, 336, 338, 340 of the *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023* (for short, "BNS").

3. Heard Mr. C.Sharan Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, appearing for the respondent-State.

4.1. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the de facto complainant and petitioner No.1/Accused No.1 are siblings and that their father passed away on 01.08.2022. It is alleged that, thereafter, one of their sister instituted a suit for partition and separate possession of respective 1/4th share in the joint family property, vide O.S. No. 211 of 2023, on the file of the learned Senior Civil Judge, Bodhan. In the said proceedings, Accused No.1 is alleged to have introduced a purportedly fake and fabricated Will Deed dated 22.06.2022, allegedly by forging the signature of their father.

4.2. It is further alleged that petitioner No.1/Accused No.1 instituted another suit, being O.S. No. 13 of 2023, against his mother and siblings before the learned V Additional District Judge, Bodhan, seeking declaration of title and recovery of possession on the basis of the said Will Deed. During the pendency of O.S. No. 13 of 2023, the said Will Deed was sent to the Forensic Expert of Truth Labs, Hyderabad, pursuant to an order passed in I.A. No. 241 of 2024. Thereafter, the expert is stated to have opined that the signature attributed to the father of the de facto complainant and Accused No.1 on the Will Deed was not the same as his signatures appearing on the other gift deeds.

4.3. It is further alleged that petitioner No.1/Accused No.1, with the assistance of petitioner Nos. 2 to 4/Accused Nos. 2 to 4, procured the registration of two gift deeds in favour of the de facto complainant and Accused No.1 by coercing the petitioner's father/executant. On the basis of the allegations made in this regard, the de facto complainant lodged a report with the police, pursuant to which the present crime came to be registered.

5.1. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the allegations levelled against the petitioners are not supported by any substantive material. He would further submit that, even assuming that a forged document was introduced during the pendency of the civil proceedings, the appropriate course would have been to raise the issue before the concerned Civil Court by filing an appropriate application or petition, and that the lodging of a police report on the basis of a private forensic laboratory report, by itself, cannot be justified.

5.2. He would further contend that there is no other legally admissible or otherwise acceptable material, at this stage, to establish that the petitioners forged the Will Deed, and that the opinion of a forensic expert cannot, by itself, be treated as conclusive or determinative of the allegation of forgery. He would also submit that the other offences alleged against the petitioners are punishable with imprisonment for a term of less than seven years.

5.3. Additionally, learned counsel would contend that there are no specific allegations against petitioner Nos. 2 to 4/Accused Nos. 2 to 4, except the general allegation that they assisted petitioner No.1/Accused No.1. It is further submitted that the petitioners are willing to cooperate with the investigation and to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by the Court. Learned counsel, therefore, would submit that permitting the prosecution to proceed against the petitioners, in the circumstances, would not be proper and, in view of their willingness to cooperate with the investigation, would pray for grant of anticipatory bail.

6.1. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, opposed the bail petition and submitted that petitioner No.1/Accused No.1 is alleged to have introduced a forged document in the civil proceedings and to have relied upon the same while contesting the suit against the defendants. He would submit that the forensic laboratory report prima facie indicates that the document in question is fabricated and, therefore, a prosecutable case is made out against petitioner No.1/Accused No.1.

6.2. As regards petitioner Nos. 2 to 4/Accused Nos. 2 to 4, learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that they are alleged to have assisted Accused No.1 in creating the disputed document and in coercing the executant in connection with the registration of two gift deeds in the year 2021. He would further submit that the investigation is still in progress and that the presence of the petitioners may be required for the purpose of

effective investigation, including custodial interrogation, if found necessary. It is, therefore, contended that grant of anticipatory bail at this stage may impede or prejudice the ongoing investigation. On these grounds, learned Additional Public Prosecutor would pray for dismissal of the bail petition.

7. I have carefully considered the submissions and perused the material available on record.

8. The specific allegation against petitioner No.1/Accused No.1 is that he caused a Will Deed to be fabricated by forging the signatures of his deceased father and thereafter introduced and relied upon the said document in the suits instituted by him and against him. Petitioner Nos.2 to 4/Accused Nos.2 to 4 are alleged to have assisted him in the alleged fabrication of the document and in the execution and registration of the gift deeds.

9. At this stage, this Court is not required to conduct a meticulous examination of the evidence or record definitive findings on disputed questions of fact, including the veracity of the defence or the ultimate genuineness of the Will Deed. The Court is, however, required to consider the nature and gravity of the allegations, the specific role attributed to each accused, the material presently available, their willingness to cooperate, and the necessity for custodial interrogation.

10. Insofar as petitioner No.1/Accused No.1 is concerned, the allegation is not merely of fabrication of the disputed Will Deed but also of introducing and relying upon it in the pending civil proceedings. The forensic opinion prima facie supports the prosecution allegation regarding the disputed signature, though its ultimate evidentiary value and the genuineness of the document are matters to be determined at the appropriate stage. Having regard to the nature of the accusation, the specific role attributed to petitioner No.1/Accused No.1, the material presently available, and the prosecution's stated requirement of custodial interrogation, this Court is not persuaded to grant him the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, his prayer is rejected.

11. The case of petitioner Nos.2 to 4/Accused Nos.2 to 4 stands on a different footing. The allegations against them are principally that they assisted petitioner No.1/Accused No.1 in creating the disputed document and were involved in the alleged coercion relating to the execution and registration of the gift deeds in the year 2021. Except for such general allegations, no specific overt act or distinct role in the alleged fabrication of the document has been attributed to them. Their expressed willingness to cooperate with the investigation further weighs in their favour. In the circumstances, the prosecution's apprehension can adequately be addressed by imposing appropriate conditions to secure their availability for investigation and to prevent interference with the investigation or witnesses.

Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the prosecution case or the genuineness of the disputed Will Deed, the prayer of petitioner Nos.2 to 4/Accused Nos.2 to 4 for anticipatory bail is allowed, subject to appropriate conditions.

12. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is partly allowed.

(A) The prayer of petitioner No.1/Accused No.1 for grant of anticipatory bail is rejected.

(B) Insofar as petitioner Nos.2 to 4/Accused Nos.2 to 4 are concerned, in the event of their arrest in connection with the above crime, or upon their surrender before the Station House Officer, Yedapally Police Station, Nizamabad District, on or before 21.10.2026, the said Officer shall release them on bail on their executing personal bonds for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-Five Thousand only) each, with two sureties for a like sum each, to the satisfaction of the Station House Officer.

(C) Petitioner Nos. 2 to 4/Accused Nos. 2 to 4 shall appear before the Investigating officer on every Saturday between 10:00 AM to 03:00 PM, for a period of twelve (12) weeks from the date of their release on bail or until filing of the final result, whichever is earlier.

(D) Petitioner Nos. 2 to 4/Accused Nos. 2 to 4 shall remain available for interrogation as and when required by the Investigating Officer during

the course of investigation and shall extend full cooperation with the Investigating Officer.

(E) Petitioner Nos. 2 to 4/Accused Nos. 2 to 4 shall strictly comply with all the conditions contemplated under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

(F) Petitioner Nos. 2 to 4/Accused Nos. 2 to 4 shall furnish their complete residential addresses, mobile numbers and other contact particulars to the Investigating Officer and shall promptly intimate any change(s) therein.

(G) Petitioner Nos. 2 to 4/Accused Nos. 2 to 4 shall not directly or indirectly induce, threaten, influence, or promise any person acquainted with the facts of the case, nor shall they tamper with prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

(H) Any wilful breach or violation of any of the aforesaid conditions shall render the petitioners liable to appropriate proceedings before the Court below, including cancellation of bail, in accordance with the provisions of the BNSS and other applicable law.

13. It is made clear that any observations made herein are confined solely to the adjudication of the present application for anticipatory bail and shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

N.TUKARAMJI, J

Date: 05.10.2026
svl