

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.10442 of 2026

DATE: 10.07.2026

BETWEEN:

Sai Prashanth

.....petitioner/accused No.1

And

The State of Telangana

.....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.535 of 2026 of Bachupally Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 336(3), 340(2), 338 read with 3(5) of BNS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner/A-1 is accused in Crime No.535 of 2026 of Bachupally Police Station for

the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 336(3), 340(2), 338 read with Section 3(5) of the BNS. The prosecution case is that the de facto complainant, intending to purchase a flat in Pragathi Green Woods Project, paid a sum of Rs.24,00,000/- to the petitioner and his associates on the representation that they were authorised to collect the sale consideration. Subsequently, the complainant learnt from the company that the petitioner was not authorised to receive such payments, that the amounts were not credited to the company's account and that the receipts and agreement of sale produced by the petitioner were forged, thereby cheating the complainant. A case was accordingly registered and, while the petitioner was attending Dundigal Police Station in compliance with the bail conditions imposed in Crime No.503 of 2026, he was arrested in the present crime on 04.07.2026 and remanded to judicial custody on 05.07.2026.

3. Heard Sri C. Lalith Kumar Reddy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, as well as Sri D. Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent-State, and Sri J. Pradeep Kiran, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2/de facto complainant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and that the present FIR is a

successive FIR arising out of the very same transaction involved in Crime No.503 of 2026 of Dundigal Police Station, in which he has already been granted bail. He contended that the dispute is purely civil in nature arising out of a partnership and commercial transaction, that no custodial interrogation is required as the investigation is substantially completed, the documentary evidence has already been collected, and the petitioner has been regularly complying with the bail conditions imposed in the earlier crime. He further submitted that the ingredients of the alleged offences are not made out, there is no material to show forgery or dishonest intention from the inception, and the petitioner is ready to cooperate with the investigation. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioner by allowing this Criminal Petition.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No.2/de facto complainant opposed the same stating that the petitioner, by falsely representing himself as an authorised representative of Pragathi Green Woods, induced the de facto complainant to part with Rs.24,00,000/- and issued forged receipts and an agreement of sale, thereby committing serious offences of cheating and forgery. It was contended that the petitioner acted with dishonest intention, caused substantial financial loss to the complainant, and his

release on bail would prejudice the investigation and enable him to influence witnesses. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner stating that the investigation is still in progress, the allegations disclose a well-planned financial fraud involving forged documents and misappropriation of substantial amounts collected from innocent purchasers, and further investigation is required to identify the involvement of other accused persons, trace the cheated amount and collect additional evidence. It was further submitted that, considering the gravity of the allegations and the possibility of the petitioner influencing witnesses or hampering the investigation, granting bail at this stage does not arise. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

7. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and a perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the petitioner is in jail since 05.07.2026. It is the specific contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner was earlier arrested in the connected Crime No.503 of 2026 on 11.06.2026 and was enlarged on bail on 23.06.2026. Despite the petitioner already being in custody in the connected crime, the investigating agency, instead of regularising his arrest in

the present crime, effected a fresh arrest when he appeared before the police in compliance with the bail conditions. It is further submitted that the allegations in the present crime are substantially similar to those in the earlier crime, both arising out of the same transaction, and therefore the petitioner's continued incarceration in the present case is unwarranted. As seen from the record, the material part of the investigation has been completed. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the incarceration period of the petitioner, 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) each, with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the PJ CJ-cum-XI Additional Metropolitan Magistrate, Kukatpally, Cyberabad.
- ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 a.m., on every Friday for a period of eight (8) week 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 437(3) of Cr.P.C. (presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 08.07.2026
SAI

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.9904 of 2026

Date: 08.07.2026

SAI