

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD  
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH

*[Special Original Jurisdiction]*

TUESDAY THE THIRTIETH DAY OF JANUARY  
TWO THOUSAND AND EIGHTEEN

PRESENT

**SMT. JUSTICE T. RAJANI**

**CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 561 OF 2018**

Between:

Kusuma Srinivas

... Petitioner/Accused in  
Cr.No. 02 of 2018  
Thoguta Police Station,  
Sangareddy district.

V/s.

The State of Telangana  
Represented by the Public Prosecutor  
High Court of Judicature for the State of  
Telangana & Andhra Pradesh,  
Through Station House Officer,  
Thoguta Police Station,  
Sanga Reddy district.  
Telangana State.

... Respondent/complainant

Counsel for the Petitioner :

Sri P. Srihari Nath

Counsel for the Respondent :

Public Prosecutor [ TS ]

The court made the following:

[order follows]

**SMT. JUSTICE T. RAJANI****CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 561 OF 2018****ORDER :**

This Criminal Petition is filed by the petitioner under section 438 Cr.P.C., seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who are accused in Crime No. 02 of 2018 of Thoguta Police Station, Sanga Reddy district, registered for the offences punishable under section 420 of I.P.C.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner/acused and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent/State.

3. The counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner herein filed I.P.No. 5 of 2017 on the file of the Court of Senior Civil Judge, Sanga Reddy, showing Mr.Baddam Mahender Reddy and others as parties and the present complaint is filed at the instance of Mr.Baddam Mahender Reddy. He submits that the defacto-complainant is a relative of Mr.Baddam Mahender Reddy.

4. The defacto-complainant may be a relative of Mr.Baddam Mahender Reddy but the averments of the complaint do not support the contention that it is filed at the best of said Mahender Reddy. It is stated in the complaint that the defacto-complainant for the first time paid Rs.99,000/- to the petitioner to be deposited in S.B.I. Life Insurance at Siddipet, received bond, and for the second time, he paid Rs.8,00,000/- and some others also paid different amounts but did not receive the bonds. It is stated in the complaint that the petitioner totally collected an amount of Rs.39,50,000/- from ten persons under the pretext that they would get more interest on their deposits, did not give bonds and he fled away from Siddipet.

5. Hence, in view of the fact that the petitioner, who is a Unit Manager in S.B.I. Life Insurance at Siddipet, played a confidence trick game by collecting Rs.39,50,000/- from various people, which they got as compensation from the Government, for submerging their lands in Mallanna Sagar Project and fled away from Siddipet, this Court opines that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The

petitioner shall surrender before the concerned court and seek regular bail. On such surrender, the concerned court shall consider and dispose of the bail application on merits and in accordance with law on the same day, subject to pressure of other work.

5. In view of the above, this Criminal Petition is dismissed.

6. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions if any, pending in this Criminal Petition shall stand closed.



**JUSTICE T. RAJANI.**

**SMT. JUSTICE T. RAJANI**

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 561 OF 2018  
**[ ANTICIPATORY BAIL :: DISMISSED ]**



Date: 30/01/2018  
Circulation No.  
Court Master: I s L