

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.17779 of 2025

DATE: 08.01.2026

BETWEEN:

Muddam Dharmesh Yadav and another

.....petitioners/accused Nos.1 and 2

And

The State of Telangana,

Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,

High Court for the State of Telangana

at Hyderabad and another.

.....Respondent/complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners, who are arrayed as accused Nos.1 and 2 in Crime No.1180 of 2025 before the

Jawaharnagar Police Station, Rachakonda Commissionerate, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 467, 420, 417, 120b read with 34 of IPC.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 15.10.2025 by the de facto complainant alleging that the petitioners, along with others, had forged the signatures of his late father on an Agreement of Sale dated 18.04.2013 in respect of land situated in Sy.Nos.142 to 145 of Rajsuk Nagar Layout, Nagaram Village, Keesara Mandal. It was alleged that the accused created fabricated documents, used forged registrar stamps and seals, and misled this Court in W.P.No.33924 of 2021 to obtain land registration orders.

3. Heard Sri V. Yadu Krishna Sainath, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners as well as Sri D. Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent – State and Sri M. Rathansingh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2-implead petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners were in no way connected with the alleged offences and that the complaint was false and motivated and that the petitioner No.1 had purchased the subject property from the son of the de facto complainant during the years 2021–2022 for valid consideration and that the dispute was purely civil in nature. He further submitted that the FIR was registered after an unexplained delay only to harass the petitioners and to deprive them of the protection under Section 41-A Cr.P.C. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner by allowing this Criminal Petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners stating that the allegations leveled against the petitioners are serious in nature. Further, the investigation was not yet completed. Therefore, at this stage, granting of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners does not arise. Hence, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. Learned counsel for the implead petitioner submitted that serious allegations of forgery and fabrication were

involved, particularly relating to the use of the alleged forged signatures of the late father of the implead petitioner in the proceedings before this Court in W.P.No.33924 of 2021 and in the Agreement of Sale purportedly executed in the year 2013, though later validated in 2021, which came to the knowledge of the implead petitioner only subsequently. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

7. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on either side and upon a careful perusal of the material available on record, it was contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the alleged document pertained to the year 2013 and that several subsequent sale deeds had been executed, as a result of which the petitioners were no longer the owners of the subject property. It was further submitted that the son of the de-facto complainant had already lodged a complaint in the month of May, wherein the allegations were different from those in the present case, and that the dispute was essentially documentary in nature. According to the learned counsel, custodial interrogation was not required as the entire case rested on documentary

evidence, which was either in the custody of the complainant or available with the Registration Department.

8. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the implead petitioner opposed the bail contending that the petitioners had committed serious offences of forgery and fabrication and that they were involved in other criminal cases, thereby establishing criminal antecedents. It was specifically pointed out that petitioner No.2/accused No.2 was involved in multiple criminal cases, namely Cr. No.96 of 2020 under Sections 354-D and 506 read with 34 IPC of Kanchanbagh Police Station dated 05.04.2020, Cr. No.320 of 2021 under Sections 323, 504 and 509 read with 34 IPC of Neredmet Police Station dated 16.05.2021, Cr. No.325 of 2023 under Sections 468, 471, 420 and 447 IPC of Keesara Police Station dated 13.05.2023, and Cr. No.214 of 2025 under Sections 316, 317, 336, 337 and 341 read with Section 3(5) of BNS of Bhongir Town Police Station dated 29.05.2025. In view of the said antecedents, it was argued that the petitioners were not entitled to the discretionary relief of bail and that custodial interrogation was necessary.

9. Having considered the rival submissions and the material on record, this Court is of the view that the allegations against petitioner No.2 disclose criminal antecedents and, therefore, the bail insofar as petitioner No.2 is concerned is liable to be dismissed. However, in respect of petitioner No.1/accused No.1, it is noted that there are no other criminal cases pending against him and that the dispute primarily revolves around documentary evidence. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to grant bail to petitioner No.1, subject to the conditions:

- i. The petitioner No.1 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Jawaharnagar Police Station, Rachakonda Commissionerate, within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release him on bail on executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/-, with two sureties, for the like sum each.
- ii. The petitioner No.1 shall abide by the other conditions stipulated in Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and co-operate with the

Investigating Officer in investigating the case.

- iii. The petitioner No.1 shall appear before the concerned Investigating Officer on every Monday between 09:00 a.m, and 05:00 p.m., for a period of eight (8) weeks or till the filing of the charge sheet, whichever is earlier and thereafter, as and when required.

10. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed in part. However, the criminal petition filed against petitioner No.2/accused No.2 is dismissed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 08.01.2026
SAI

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.17779 of 2025

Date: 08.01.2026

SAI