



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH  
AT AMARAVATI  
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

**[3396]**

WEDNESDAY, THE ELEVENTH DAY OF MARCH  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA**

**CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 1728/2026**

**Between:**

1. BOYAPATI SIVA RAM,, S/O NARAYANASWAMY, AGED 34 YEARS,  
OCC BUSINESS, KARUTLAPALLI VILLAGE, KUDERU MANDAL,  
ANANTHAPURAMU DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 515711.
2. POLURU NAGA SUNDAR KUMAR,, S/O RAVINDRA, AGE 28 YEARS,  
OCC BUSINESS, R/O PLOT NO.78, PHASE-1, MYTHRINAGAR,  
MADINAGUDA, MIYAPUR, HYDERABAD, TELANGANA - 500049,  
NOW RESIDING AT RAMBAGAR, ANANTHAPURAMU.

**...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)**

**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, Rep. by the Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amaravati.

**...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT**

Petition under Section 437/438/439/482 of Cr.P.C and 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the S.H.O., Ananthapuramu I Town PS, Anantapur District to enlarge the petitioners/A9 to A10 on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest in connection with Crime No. 359 of 2025 of Ananthapuramu I Town PS, Anantapur District and to pass such

**Counsel for the Petitioner/accused(S):**

1. V V LAKSHMI NARAYANA

**Counsel for the Respondent/complainant:**

1.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

**THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA****CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 1728/2026****ORDER:**

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity "BNSS") by the petitioners/Accused Nos. 9 & 10 seeking grant of pre-arrest bail in connection with Crime No. 359 of 2025 of Ananthapuramu I Town PS, Anantapur District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 336(3), 318(4), 324(4), 329(4), 351(2) r/w 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The brief facts of the prosecution case are that the case relates to allegations of forgery for the purpose of cheating, criminal trespass, causing damage to property and criminal intimidation. The alleged incident occurred on 20.12.2025 at about 11:30 AM at D.No.28-3-535, Sarada Nagar, Ananthapuramu Town. It is alleged that the accused, B. Sakunthala, created a fabricated Will dated 01.07.2025 in her favour as if it had been executed by the deceased Dr. S. Kanaka Durga and subsequently executed a General Power of Attorney in favour of E.Shekar, which was registered in the Sub-Registrar Office, Ananthapuramu. On the strength of the said documents, she falsely claimed ownership over the property belonging to the deceased Dr. S. Kanaka Durga. The complainant, Gaddam Sai Manohar, who is the nephew of the original property owner, lodged a report before the police on 25.12.2025 at about 10:00 PM, based on which the present case was registered and investigation was taken up.

3. Heard Sri V.V.Lakshmi Narayana, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mrs.K.Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor on behalf of the State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners herein are Accused Nos.9 and 10 and that they have no role to play in the alleged offence. He further submits that the allegation against Accused No.1 is that she created a Will in her favour in respect of the property belonging to the maternal aunt of the de facto complainant. Accused No.1 was working as a maid servant under the deceased, who is the maternal aunt of the de facto complainant. It is further submitted that Accused No.2 is the GPA holder of Accused No.1, Accused Nos.3 and 4 are the attestors to the said document, Accused No.5 is the scribe, Accused No.6 is the notary of the document, and Accused No.7 is alleged to be part of the conspiracy. Learned counsel contends that the present petitioners have no connection whatsoever with the alleged crime and that they are contractors by profession and engineering graduates. He submits that the offences alleged against them are not attracted to the petitioners. It is further contended that the de facto complainant himself created a Family Tree Certificate through the VRO, which is a fabricated document. The learned counsel submits that the petitioners are ready to furnish sureties to the satisfaction of the Court and prays to allow the petition.

5. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the petition and submitted that the petitioners/Accused Nos.9 and 10 played a vital role in the commission of the offence. Though their names were not mentioned in the FIR initially, they were subsequently arrayed as accused based on the information collected during the course of investigation. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor further submitted that the *modus operandi* of Accused Nos. 7 to 10 involves identifying lands that are not being actively managed by anyone and then creating fabricated documents to illegally claim such lands, thereby cheating the public and extracting money. It was also submitted that Accused Nos. 1 to 5 and 8 have already been arrested and subsequently released on regular bail. She would further submit that if the petitioners are enlarged on anticipatory bail, there is every likelihood of their tampering with evidence, influencing witnesses, and interfering with the ongoing investigation. Given their active involvement in the alleged scheme and the serious nature of the offences, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor prayed for the dismissal of the petition.

6. Considering the submissions made and on perusal of the material on record, as rightly contended by the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, the investigation is at a nascent stage and is pending for the examination of several witnesses to uncover the entire scheme. The *modus operandi* of Accused Nos. 7 to 10, as submitted by the prosecution, involves identifying lands that are not being actively managed by anyone and then creating fabricated documents to illegally claim such lands, thereby cheating the public

and extracting money. The truth or otherwise of these allegations cannot be decided at this stage. At this juncture, this Court is of the opinion that this is not a fit case for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, as it may lead to influencing witnesses and tampering with evidence. Therefore, this Criminal Petition is liable to be dismissed.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

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

---

**DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA**

Date: 11.03.2026

UPS

205

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

**CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 1728/2026**

Date: 11.03.2026.

UPS