IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION No. 14226 OF 2026

(CNR No. HBHC010595952026)

DATE: 03.09.2026

Between :

Mr. A.Ramratan

… Petitioner/Accused

AND

The State of Telangana, Represented through Public Prosecutor, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad, (Through P.S. Banjara Hills), and two others.

… Respondents.

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of the *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023* (for short, "BNSS"), seeking the relief of transit anticipatory bail.

2. The petitioner is accused in FIR No. 11993002260612 of 2026 on the file of Adipur Police Station, Gandhidham, A Division Police station, Kutch East District, Gujarat State and facing accusations for the offences punishable under Sections 336(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2) of the *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023* (for short, "BNS").

3. Heard Mr. C. Sharan Reddy, learned counsel, argued on behalf of Mr. Koushik Kanduri, learned counsel for the petitioner; Mr.Syed Yasar Mamoon, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, representing respondent Nos.1 and 2-State and Ms. Rubaina S Khatoon, learned counsel for respondent No.3/de facto complainant.

4.1. Briefly stated the relevant facts are that, a crime has been registered against the petitioner in the State of Gujarat alleging that, in April 2025, the petitioner purchased raw salt worth Rs.15 Crores from the de facto complainant-companies. Towards payment of the sale consideration, the petitioner issued certain cheques. Upon presentation, the said cheques were dishonoured by the banker, pursuant to which proceedings under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, were initiated.

4.2. It is further alleged that, during the pendency of the said proceedings, the petitioner is alleged to have prepared false and forged letters/letterheads dated 13.01.2025 in the name of the de facto complainant-companies and to have projected false information to the effect that the cheques issued by him had been cancelled. It is alleged that the petitioner also forged the signatures of the authorised signatories of the said companies and produced the fabricated documents before the learned IV Additional Sessions Judge, Gandhidham, in an application for anticipatory bail filed on 07.10.2025, and

thereby obtained the benefit of bail. On the basis of these allegations, the offences in question are stated to have been committed by the petitioner.

5.1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, earlier, on the complaint lodged by the de facto complainant-companies, another crime, being Crime No.11993006250851 of 2025 of Gandhidham Police Station, was registered, wherein the petitioner was shown as an accused for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2) and 318(4) of the BNS. In the said matter, this Court, having considered the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner, granted transit anticipatory bail to enable him to appear before the competent Court.

5.2. It is further submitted that the petitioner herein subsequently lodged FIR No.726 of 2026 before Banjara Hills Police Station, alleging that the cheques issued by him had been illegally pressed into service by the de facto complainant and that a false case had been registered against him. According to learned counsel, after the de facto complainant came to know about the registration of the said FIR, the present crime was lodged after a lapse of approximately ten months from the alleged incident of obtaining anticipatory bail, relying upon certain documents.

5.3. Learned counsel further contends that the allegations made against the petitioner regarding fabrication of documents are without any basis and

that the documents in question are genuine. It is also submitted that the other offences alleged against the petitioner are punishable with imprisonment of less than seven years and that the petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate with and participate in the investigation. However, since a notice under Section 94 of the BNSS has been served upon the petitioner by the Gujarat Police, he apprehends his arrest. It is therefore submitted that the petitioner seeks transit anticipatory bail for the limited purpose of enabling him to avail himself of the appropriate remedies available under law before the competent Court in the State of Gujarat.

6. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, opposed the petition. However, he submitted that, the Police of the State had communicated with the Director General of Police of the State of Gujarat and that information in that regard were still awaited.

7.1. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.3/de facto complainant opposed the petition and submitted that the petitioner has been aware of the pending proceedings since August 2026; nevertheless, he has, till date, failed to take any appropriate steps to approach the competent Courts in the State of Gujarat for availing himself of the remedies claimed by him.

7.2. It is further pleaded that the allegations against the petitioner are specific and that the proceedings initiated earlier demonstrate the conduct of

the petitioner in dealing with the judicial process pending against him before the Courts in Gujarat. She also submits that this Court had earlier granted transit pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in Crime No.5864 of 2025 on 14.05.2026 and pointed out that, on 24.05.2026, a search was conducted at the residential house of the petitioner/accused, during which his father informed the police that the petitioner was out of the country and was in Oman. According to learned counsel, despite having obtained the benefit of transit anticipatory bail, the petitioner misused the said relief. In these circumstances, it is submitted that the petitioner ought to be directed to avail himself of the regular remedies before the competent Courts concerned and that no further relief of transit anticipatory bail should be extended to him, therefore prayed for dismissal of the petition.

8. I have carefully considered the rival submissions and perused material available on record.

9. The specific allegation against the petitioner is that, in the backdrop of another registered crime, he allegedly submitted before the concerned Court, in support of his application for anticipatory bail, documents purportedly belonging to the de facto complainant-companies. These documents are alleged to have been fabricated, including by forging the signatures of their authorised signatories. Thus, the allegations relate not

merely to the underlying commercial dispute, but also to the alleged use and production of fabricated documents in judicial proceedings.

10. It is a settled principle that the power to grant transit pre-arrest protection can be exercised by a High Court, in an appropriate case, where the apprehended arrest relates to an offence registered outside its territorial jurisdiction. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Priya Indoria v. State of Karnataka*, 2023 INSC 1008, recognised the jurisdiction of a High Court to grant transit anticipatory bail to enable an applicant to approach the competent Court within whose territorial jurisdiction the offence is alleged to have been committed. The exercise of such jurisdiction, however, is discretionary and is required to be moulded having regard to the facts and circumstances of each case, including the nature and gravity of the allegations, the conduct of the applicant, the likelihood of his cooperation with the investigation, and the requirement of securing access to the jurisdictional Court for seeking appropriate remedies. The object of transit anticipatory bail is essentially to afford limited protection to a person apprehending arrest outside the territorial jurisdiction of the Court approached by him, so as to enable him to approach the competent jurisdictional Court. Such protection is therefore ordinarily required to be confined to a limited period and subject to appropriate conditions, without trenching upon the jurisdiction of the Court competent to consider the applicant's prayer for regular or anticipatory bail on merits.

11. In the present case, the allegation assumes significance because the documents alleged to have been fabricated are stated to form part of the record of the concerned Court. Accordingly, their authenticities, as well as the circumstances in which they came to be produced, are matters that require investigation and consideration by the competent authorities and the jurisdictional Court. In this context, the petitioner seeks transit protection for the limited purpose of approaching the jurisdictional Courts in the State of Gujarat and availing himself of the remedies available to him in accordance with law.

12. Having regard to the aforesaid circumstances, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the allegations or the petitioner's defence, this Court is of the view that a limited protective order would adequately balance the competing interests. Accordingly, it would be appropriate to extend transit anticipatory bail to the petitioner for a limited period, subject to certain conditions.

13. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed by granting transit anticipatory bail subject to following conditions;

(i) The petitioner shall, in the event of arrest in connection with FIR No. 11993002260612 of 2026 on the file of Adipur Police Station, Gandhidham, Kutch East District, Gujarat State, be released on interim transit anticipatory bail for a period of fifteen days upon

furnishing a personal bond of Rs.25,000/- with one surety of the like amount, subject to the following conditions:

(ii) The petitioner shall approach the competent Court having territorial jurisdiction by 15.09.2026;

(iii) The petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required;

(iv) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly induce, threaten, or promise any person acquainted with the facts of the case and shall not tamper with evidence;

(v) This protection shall automatically stand vacated on 15.09.2026 or upon intervention by the competent Court, whichever is earlier.

(vi) It is made clear that no petition for extension of time granted in this transit Anticipatory bail would be entertained.

Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

N.TUKARAMJI, J

Date: 03.09.2026
svl