

[3396]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

TUESDAY ,THE THIRTY FIRST DAY OF MARCH

TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

:PRESENT:

THONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 2185 OF 2026



Between:

1. Dasari Nagabhusanam,(A1)S/o. Dasari Satyam, aged about 52 years. Business, R/o. Plot No.170, House No. 5-222/4, Krishna Nagar Colony, Moulali, Rangareddy District, Telengana State.
2. Mantripragada Jayasri, (A-3), W/o. M. Venkataramana Moorthy, aged about 49 years, R/o. D. No-3-5-125/7, Krishna Nagar, NFC Building. Meerpet, Moulali, Secunderabad, Telangana State.

Petitioners/Accused No.1 & 3

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, (S.H.O., Chandragiri,U. P.S.) Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, at Amaravati.

Respondent

Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased sed to direct the Station House Officer, Chandragiri UP.S., Tirupati District to enlarge the petitioners/AI & A.3 on bail in the event of arrest in connection with the Cr. No. 22 of 2026 on the file of Chandragiri UP.S., Tirupati District,

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and the affidavit filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of Sri K KRANTI CHAITANYA Advocate for the Petitioner(s), PUBLIC PROSECUTOR Advocate for the Respondent(s) and the Court made the following.

ORDER



THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 2185/2025

ORDER :

The Criminal Petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNSS') by the Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 3, for granting of pre-arrest bail in connection with Cr. No. 22 of 2026 on the file of Chandragiri UP.S., Tirupati District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406, 409, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120 (b), 506 r/w 34 of Indian Penal Code.

2. Heard Sri K.Kranti Chaitanya, learned counsel for the petitioners and Ms.K.Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor on behalf of the State. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor would submit that notice is served on the defacto complainant through police and received instructions to submit her arguments.

3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the complainant, Smt. Meena Vijay, being the owner of the disputed land, executed a General Power of Attorney in favour of A1. A1, in collusion with A2, manipulated and fraudulently registered the document, and later got it validated through illegal means despite its earlier rejection. Using the said document, A1 unlawfully transferred the land to A3, who subsequently sold it to A4, causing wrongful loss to the complainant. The accused acted in conspiracy to cheat the complainant, and when she later visited the land, A1 threatened her with dire consequences to prevent her from entering the property.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that this is purely a civil dispute between the Accused No.1 and the defacto complainant. Learned counsel for the petitioners would further submit that the defacto complainant in this matter, filed a civil suit in O.S.No.76 of 2019, seeking cancellation of the sale deed executed by Accused No.1 in favour of Accused No.2 by virtue of registered General Power of Attorney executed by the defacto complainant in favour of the Accused No.1. Learned counsel would further submit that the petitioner No.1 i.e., Accused No.1, filed counter claim seeking specific performance regarding 'B' and 'C' plaint schedule property against the defacto complainant. Learned counsel would further submit that the defacto complainant executed registered sale deed in favour of the 3rd parties on 30.01.2023 pending the civil suit. Accused No.1 got impleaded the 3rd parties who purchased the 'B' and 'C' plaint schedule property in O.S.No.76 of 2019. Learned counsel would further submit that even as per the contents of the complaint submitted by the defacto complainant in the present case, fresh allegation against the accused is that on 29.01.2026 when she has visited the schedule property, she received threatening call from the accused No.1. Learned counsel for the petitioners would further submit that the defacto complainant herein filed an application in the civil suit O.S.No.76 of 2019, seeking rejection of the counter claim filed by the accused No.1 in the said suit. Learned counsel would further submit that the petitioner No.2/accused No.3 herein purchased the property from the accused No.2 under registered sale deed. Learned counsel finally prays to allow the petition by imposing any



conditions since the defacto complainant wanted to colour the transaction which is purely civil in nature as a criminal case.

5. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the petition and would submit that the investigation is at nascent stage and as per the contents of the complaint, the petitioners herein in collusion with the other accused executed registered sale deeds by creating forged documents and also threatened the complainant with dire consequences.

6. Considering the submissions made and a fair look at the material placed on record, as rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners, this case is emanated from the civil disputes between the Accused No.1 and the defacto complainant. The defacto complainant filed a civil suit for cancellation of sale deed executed by the accused No.1 in favour of the accused No.2. Accused No.1 has filed a counter claim in the very same suit seeking specific performance of agreement said to have been executed by the defacto complainant. During the pendency of the civil suit, the defacto complainant has executed some sale deed against the third parties and they are also impleaded in the said suit. The fresh allegation now attributed against the petitioners is that when the defacto complainant received a call from some unknown number, she has called accused No1 and he threatened her with dire consequences. In that view of the matter, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on the following conditions:



- 
- i. The petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 3, shall appear before the concerned Magistrate Court within a period of one (1) week from the date of this order and shall furnish personal bonds for Rs.20,000/- (Rupees twenty thousand only) each with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the said Court;
 - ii. On release, the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 3, shall appear before the Station House Officer concerned, once in a week i.e., on every Saturday, between 10:00 AM and 05:00 PM, till filing of charge sheet.
 - iii. The petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 3, shall make themselves available for investigation as and when required and shall cooperate with the Investigating Officer for further investigation.
 - iv. The petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 3, shall not cause any threat, inducement or promise to the prosecution witnesses;
 - v. The petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 3, shall surrender their passports, if any, to the Court concerned. If they claim that they do not have passports, they shall submit an affidavit to that effect to the Court concerned.
 - vi. The petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 3, shall not leave the country, without express permission from the concerned Court.

7. In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, the prosecution is at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.



8. It is also made clear that the observations made in this order are only for the purpose of deciding the bail application and they shall not be construed as opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

As a sequel thereto, the miscellaneous applications, if any, pending in this Criminal Petition shall stand closed.

//TRUE COPY//

For

SD/-SK MD RAFI
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Judicial Magistrate of I Class at Palasa, Srikakulam District.
2. The Superintendent of Central Jail, Visakhapatnam District.
3. The Station House Officer, Chandragiri UP.S, Tirupati District.
4. One CC to SRI. K KRANTI CHAITANYA Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CCs to PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, High Court of Andhra Pradesh [OUT]
6. One spare copy

HIGH COURT

DR.VJPJ

DATED:31/03/2026

BAIL ORDER

CRLP.No.2185 of 2026

ALLOWED

