

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT
HYDERABAD**

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.2488 of 2026

DATE:06.03.2026

Between:

D.Gopal, and 2 others

.... Petitioners/accused

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court at Hyderabad,
Through LB Nagar Police Station.

.... Respondent

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners, who are arrayed as accused in Crime No.720 of 2025 of L.B. Nagar Police Station, Rachakonda District, registered for the offences

punishable under Sections 406, 420 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that the de-facto complainant lodged a report stating that in the year 2021 he paid an amount to Krithika Infra Developers, L.B. Nagar, in the presence of its Managing Director Dumavath Srikanth, for the purchase of a plot in Survey No.215 situated at Boduppal. However, the registration of the said plot was not completed. Despite the complainant making several visits to the office of the said company, the matter was continuously postponed. Subsequently, the complainant came to know that the firm had cheated him as well as several other persons. It is alleged that the staff of Krithika Infra Developers, including the Managing Director Dumavath Srikanth, Srikanth, Shashikanth, Radha Bhukya and others, were involved in cheating the complainant and other purchasers. Basing on the said report, the police registered the above crime for the aforesaid offences.

3. Heard Sri Pally Vinod Kumar Reddy, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, and Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are in no way connected with the said Infra Company and that petitioner No.1 is the father of accused No.3, petitioner No.2 is the wife of accused No.3, and petitioner No.3 is the brother of accused No.3, and they have been falsely implicated in the present case merely on account of their relationship with accused No.3. It is further submitted that petitioner No.2, who is shown as accused No.1, was only made a partner in the partnership firm for the limited purpose of execution of documents and she was not involved in the day-to-day affairs of the company. He further submitted that the petitioners have not received any amount from the complainant and they had no role in the alleged transactions and that accused No.3 has already been arrested and released on bail, the investigation is substantially progressed, and the custodial interrogation of the present petitioners is not required. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioners by allowing this Criminal Petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the petition contending that the allegations against the petitioners are serious in nature and that several victims have been cheated by the accused persons in the guise of

selling plots. He further submitted that the investigation is still in progress and a huge amount of money is involved in the alleged transactions. Therefore, it is prayed that the petition be dismissed.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the petitioners are family members of accused No.3. The partnership deed produced before this Court shows that petitioner No.2, who is the wife of accused No.3, is shown as a partner in the firm, whereas petitioner Nos.1 and 3 are not shown as partners in the said partnership firm. Accused No.3 has already been arrested and released on bail. The allegations in the present crime appear to arise out of transactions relating to the said company, and the role of petitioner Nos.1 and 3 does not prima facie indicate their direct involvement in the management of the firm. Though petitioner No.2 is shown as a partner in the firm, the extent of her involvement in the day-to-day affairs of the company requires investigation. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the relationship of the petitioners with accused No.3, and the fact that accused No.3 has already been arrested and released on bail, this Court is of the

opinion that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not necessary at this stage. Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioners shall surrender before the Station House Officer, L.B. Nagar Police Station, Rachakonda District, within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release them on bail on executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/- each, with two sureties, for the like sum each.
- ii. The petitioners 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 petitioners shall appear before the concerned Investigating Officer on every Monday between 09:00 a.m, and

05:00 p.m., for a period of 8 weeks or
till the filing of the charge sheet,
whichever is earlier, and thereafter, as
and when required.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand
closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 06.03.2026
nsp

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.2488 of 2026

Date: 06.03.2026

nsp