IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.16597 of 2025

DATE: 30.12.2025

BETWEEN:

Mohammed Reshma Jabeen

.....petitioner/accused No.4

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana
at Hyderabad.

.....Respondent/complainant

ORDER

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner, who is arrayed as accused No.4 in Crime No.80 of 2025 before the EOW Police

Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4) read with 61(2) of BNS, Section 5 of TSPDFEA, Sections 3 and 4 of PC & MCSBA and Section4 read with 76 of CFA.

2. The brief facts of the case are that a complaint received on 21.10.2025 from the de-facto complainant alleging that Mohammed Ali and Mohammed Reshma Jabeen of Nasreen Chit Funds, along with others, had conducted unregistered chit fund business and cheated several subscribers by collecting huge amounts and absconding without repaying the chit amounts. It was alleged that the accused persons had conspired and diverted deposits amounting to about Rs.12,06,73,273/-. Based on the said complaint and the endorsement of the DCP, Crimes and EOW, Cyberabad, a case in Crime No.80/2025 was registered.

3. Heard Sri E. Srinivas Reddy, 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 allegations leveled against the petitioner were false, baseless and motivated, and that the petitioner had no role whatsoever in the alleged chit fund business and that the petitioner neither established any financial establishment nor accepted any deposits from the complainant or others, and therefore the provisions of the Depositors Act and other penal statutes were not attracted. He further submitted that there were no specific allegations except a vague claim that the petitioner assisted another accused, and that the petitioner was implicated only to exert pressure. He contended that the entire evidence was documentary in nature, the investigation was substantially completed and there was no possibility of tampering with evidence. 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 filed counter affidavit opposing the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner stating that the case was registered on the complaint of the de-facto complainant in the subject crime for serious economic offences relating to large-

scale chit fund fraud, and that during investigation the police had examined 33 witnesses, collected substantial documentary evidence and arrested accused No.2, whose confessional statement led to seizure of incriminating material. He further submitted that the investigation clearly established that accused No.2, along with other accused including the petitioner/A-4, had conducted unauthorized chit schemes, diverted deposits through multiple bank accounts, and cheated as many as 66 victims to the tune of about Rs.12.06 crores. He contended that the petitioner, being the wife of Accused No.2, actively assisted in running the chit business and that properties acquired out of the cheated amounts were kept in her name, Further, the allegations leveled against the petitioner are serious in nature and there are number of victims in this case. Further, the investigation was not yet completed. Therefore, at this stage, granting of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner does not arise. Hence, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and upon a perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the petitioner is arrayed as

accused No.4 and is the wife of accused No.2. The main allegation against accused No.2 is that he is the Director of accused No.1-company, and the allegation against the petitioner is that she was also actively involved and that accused No.2 purchased the property in her name. As seen from the record, the principal allegations are against accused No.2. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court deems it fit to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:

i. The petitioner shall surrender before the Station House Officer, EOW Police Station, Cyberabad Commissionerate, within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release her on bail on executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/-, each, with two sureties, for the like sum each.

ii. The petitioner 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 petitioner shall appear before the concerned Investigating Officer on every Monday between 09:00 a.m, and 05:00 p.m., for a period of eight (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: 30.12.2025
SAI

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.16597 of 2025

Date: 30.12.2025
SAI