

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10126 OF 2026

DATE : 13.07.2026

Between :

Bandaru Chandra Sekhar

... Petitioner/A.1

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep., by Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Telangana at Hyderabad

... Respondent/Complainant

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused No.1 in Crime No.1100 of 2025 of Bachupally Police Station, Cyberabad. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 467, 468, 406, 419 and 420 r/w.34 of Indian Penal Code.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the de facto complainant and his mother purchased Plot No.43, admeasuring 200 square yards, situated in Survey No.28/Part, Bachupally Village, Medchal-Malkajgiri District, under a

registered Sale Deed dated 19.12.2023 for valuable consideration. Prior to the sale, accused Bandaru Babu, represented by his alleged agreement holder Ganji Koteswara Rao, along with Bandaru Chandra Sekhar and a real estate broker, represented that Bandaru Babu was the absolute owner of the property and induced the complainant to purchase it by producing title documents. Believing their representations, the complainant entered into an agreement of sale, paid the sale consideration, and obtained a registered sale deed. Subsequently, the complainant came to know that one of the link documents in the chain of title was forged, as it purported to show a sale by a person who had died prior to the alleged transaction. Upon verification of the certified copies obtained from the Sub-Registrar's Office, the complainant found material discrepancies in the title documents and alleged that the accused, in furtherance of a criminal conspiracy, had fabricated and forged the title documents to cheat him and his mother, thereby causing wrongful loss. Hence, requested the police to take necessary action against the accused basing on which the present crime is registered.

3. Heard Sri Ch. Venkat Reddy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri D.Arun Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the respondent.

4. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that, according to the prosecution case itself, accused Nos.6 to 8 had informed accused No.1 about the death of original owner of the property and had proposed for creation of forged documents. He also contended that the allegation of forging documents is specifically attributed to accused Nos.6 to 8 and not to the petitioner/accused No.1. Learned counsel submits that Section 467 IPC, which relates to forgery of valuable security or other documents carrying severe punishment, is not attracted against the petitioner, and consequently he is entitled to the benefit of notice under Section 41-A Cr.P.C. in terms of the guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar**¹. He further contended that petitioner is innocent, no recovery has been affected from him, all material witnesses have already been examined, and there is no possibility of tampering with the evidence or influencing witnesses. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner is a

¹ (2014) 8 SCC 273

permanent resident of Hyderabad, the sole breadwinner of his family, has been in judicial custody since 22.05.2026, and that the investigating agency has not sought police custody, which indicates that his further custodial interrogation is not required. He further contended that accused No.2 has already been granted bail and that the petitioner is ready to cooperate with the investigation and abide by any conditions imposed by this Court. Hence, prayed this Court to grant bail to the petitioner by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed bail contending that the petitioner is the main conspirator in the commission of offence. After coming to know from A-6 to A-8 that the original owner of the subject property had died, petitioner entered into a criminal conspiracy with them to grab the property. In furtherance of the conspiracy, he got the property registered in the name of his father (A.2) by using forged documents and by impersonating the deceased owner. Thereafter, he actively participated in the sale of property by inducing the complainant to purchase it on the strength of forged title documents and fabricated encumbrance records, and facilitated execution of the sale deed. It is further contended that A-1 received about Rs.50,00,000/- as his share

from the sale proceeds and utilized the amount for clearing family debts, invested in a garment business, and also for his personal expenses. Hence, considering his active role in the conspiracy and the severity of allegations, he is not entitled to be enlarged on bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Having considered the submissions made by both sides and the material available on record, this Court observes that admittedly petitioner is in jail from 21.05.2026 and the allegations against him are that he intentionally fabricated the document, induced the defacto complainant and sold the property to him which does not belong to him. As seen from the record, Lws.1 to 20 are examined and that the investigation is based on the documentary evidence. Considering the nature of allegation, period of incarceration of petitioner in jail and the progress in investigation, this Court deems it fit 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 sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the Principal Junior Civil Judge-cum-XI Additional Metropolitan Magistrate, Medchal-Malkajgiri at Kukatpally.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m and 5.00 p.m., on every Monday 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 shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 483(2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

Date : 13.07.2026
Rds

K. SUJANA, J

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10126 OF 2026

DATE : 13.07.2026

Rds