THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.12559 of 2025

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed seeking the Court to enlarge the petitioner, on bail, who is arrayed as accused No.3 in Crime No.65 of 2025 of Economic Offences Wing, Cyberabad Commissionerate. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 316(2), 318 (4), 336(3), 340 r/w.61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and under Section 5 of Telangana Protection of Depositors of Financial Establishment Act, 1999.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 16.09.2025 at around 11:00 hours, the de facto complainant lodged a complaint with the DCP Crimes and EOW, Cyberabad, alleging that Smt. M. Sandhya Rani, her husband Namburi Sridhar, their son Koushik, P. Subbaraju, Y. Ramdas, and others had cheated him by inducing him to invest large sums of money in the textile and garment business under the name "Sri Sai Ram Enterprises." The complainant alleged that the accused presented fake purchase orders from reputed companies, hospitals, and schools, produced forged GST and TDS receipts,

and persuaded him to invest money totaling Rs.41.915 crores into various accounts controlled by them. The complainant claimed that when he later sought the return of his investments, the accused threatened him and refused repayment.

3. Heard Sri D. Jagadishwar Rao, 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.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had no involvement in the alleged fraudulent activities and was himself a victim of Smt. Sandhya Rani and her associates and that he had never participated in business dealings with the defacto complainant nor benefited financially from his investments. He further submitted that the only allegation against the petitioner was that he introduced the defacto complainant to the other accused, which, according to the counsel, did not constitute any offence. All financial transactions are directly between the defacto complainant and Smt. Sandhya Rani’s group. The counsel further submitted that the petitioner possessed documents evidencing his status as an investor and had no connection to the fraudulent schemes.

Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner by allowing this Criminal Petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioner played a key role in inducing the complainant to invest Rs.41.91 crores by posing as a trusted acquaintance, introducing him to the co-accused, and facilitating the fraudulent transactions. He further submitted that the petitioner was also involved in preparing fake documents, diverting funds, and intimidating the complainant and that the petitioner was absconding, had switched off his mobile, and was evading arrest, indicating a flight risk. The prosecution emphasized that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential to trace the defrauded funds, identify further victims, and uncover the broader conspiracy. Therefore, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and a perusal of the material available on record, it is seen that the complainant in his complaint stated that at the instance of petitioner herein he invested the amount with A.1 and A.2. A.1 created fake purchase bills and cheated the complainant. In the complaint it is also mentioned that he visited Sai Ram Enterprises, Kukatpalli in October 2023 where,

the complainant was introduced to one Ramdas, Sridhar, Koushik by Sandhya Rani and her husband as their active partners who help them in procuring orders from various organizations, invest money and earn profits. They also showed him the premises where he saw nearly 150 employees working, stitching material and machinery were available in the premises and they also shown the GST, TDS and other receipts from various authorities to make him believe that they are running a legally abiding business organization which shows that the complainant has not simply believed the petitioner herein, he made his enquiries by visiting the premises and petitioner herein is not the partner or Director of A.1 company, as such custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. Considering all these aspects this Court deems it fit to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions :

i. The petitioner/A.3 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, EOW Police Station, Cyberabad, within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release the petitioner on bail on his executing a personal bond for Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) with two sureties, for the like sum each.

ii. The petitioner/A.3 shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 a.m., on every Wednesday for a period of eight (8) weeks, for the purpose of investigation and thereafter, as and when required.

iii. The petitioner/A.3 shall abide by the other conditions stipulated in Section 482(2) of BNSS and co-operate with the Investigating Officer in investigating the case.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous petitions if any pending shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date :27.10.2025
Rds

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

<u>CRIMINAL PETITION No.12559 of 2025</u>

<u>DATE :27.10.2025</u>

Rds