IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.19127 of 2026
(CNR No.HBHC010795402026)

DATED: 25.11.2026

BETWEEN:

Puttagalla Rahul

.... Petitioner/Accused No.7

AND

The State of Telangana,
Through Police Station Osmania University,
Hyderabad. Rep. by Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Hyderabad. .... Respondent

: O R D E R :

This Criminal Petition is filed under Sections 480 and 483 of Bharatiya Hyderabad Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking to enlarge the petitioner, who is arrayed as accused No.7 in Crime No.311 of 2026, Osmania University Police Station, Hyderabad, on bail. The said crime was registered for the offences punishable under Sections 316(1)(2), 308, 308(5), 336, 338, 339, 61(1)(2), 318(4), 319(2), 336(3), 337, 340(2) of BNS and Section 175(3) of BNSS.

2. The complainant, AQ Square Realtors Pvt. Ltd., lodged a private complaint alleging that it had entered into a development agreement with Mr. Kareem Alladin on 04.07.2023 in respect of land admeasuring Ac.373.22 guntas in Sy.No.613 of Nadergul Village, and

that Accused Nos.1 to 9 were interfering with its possession and demanding money. It was further alleged that Accused Nos.1 to 3 had earlier received Rs.60 lakhs under an MOU dated 21.02.2023 and subsequently demanded Rs.40 crores by threatening to create disputes and obstruct the development of the property. It is further alleged that Accused Nos.1 to 9, in conspiracy with other accused, fabricated a Gift Deed and Panchanama claiming rights over Ac.100 guntas of the subject land and filed a compromise petition before the Lok Adalat. The complainant suspected the genuineness of the said documents, as the State Archives and Research Institute, Tarnaka, reportedly opined that the documents were dubious, appeared to have been subsequently created and could not be authenticated from its records. Based on the same a case was registered for the abovementioned offences.

3. Heard Smt. M. Saritha, learned counsel on record for the petitioner and Sri M. Vivekananda Reddy, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, appearing for the respondent-State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are general and omnibus in nature, without attributing any specific overt act, role or participation in the alleged offences and that the petitioner is neither alleged to have demanded or received any money nor entered into any transaction

with the complainant. It is contended that the dispute essentially arises out of a civil issue concerning title and possession of land in Sy.No.613, which has been given a criminal colour and that the petitioner is neither a party nor a signatory to the alleged Gift Deed, Panchanama or Lok Adalat compromise, and there is no material establishing his involvement in the alleged forgery or conspiracy. It is further submitted that the prosecution case is predominantly documentary in nature, the relevant documents being in the custody of Government authorities and Courts and no recovery or custodial interrogation is required from the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner is suffering from certain health ailments, and in support of the same, he has filed a medical certificate. Therefore, prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioner by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor opposed the grant of bail, submitting on instructions, that the investigation was still pending and that the charge sheet had not yet been filed. However, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor conceded that Accused Nos.1, 3 and some of the other accused had already been enlarged on bail and that the petitioner stands on the same footing as that of the other accused, who were already enlarged on bail.

6. Memo dated 23.11.2026 was filed by the learned counsel for the petitioner stating that Accused Nos.1, 3 and others had filed Crl.M.P.Nos. 2782, 2783, 2784 and 2785, seeking to be enlarged on bail. The learned trial Court allowed the said petitions and granted bail to those accused. As the petitioner-accused No.7, stands on the same footing as the accused, who have been granted bail, the petitioner seeks bail on the ground of parity.

7. On perusal of the remand case diary, it is evident that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 08.10.2026. The investigating agency has examined as many as 12 witnesses (LWs 1 to 12). Thus, a substantial part of the investigation appears to have been completed. The material placed before this Court does not indicate any specific requirement of further custodial interrogation of the petitioner. Though the charge sheet is yet to be filed, the said circumstance, by itself may not warrant the continued detention of the petitioner, particularly when the material witnesses have already been examined and some of the prime accused have already been released on bail by the learned Trial Court.

8. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, the stage of investigation, the period of incarceration already undergone, the health condition of the petitioner-A7 and the fact that

A1, A3 and other similarly placed accused have already been enlarged on bail, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner-A7 stands on the same footing as that of the other accused. Therefore, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner-A7, subject to his complying with following conditions:

i. The petitioner-A7 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 IV Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate at Hyderabad.

ii. The petitioner-A7 shall appear before the concerned SHO between 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., on every Sunday 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-A7 shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C. (presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).

iv. The petitioner-A7 shall not directly or indirectly influence, threaten, or induce any of the prosecution witnesses.

v. In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, the prosecution is at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail.

9. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY, J

Date: 25.11.2026
SS

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.19127 of 2026

DATED: 25.11.2026

SS