IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.883 of 2026

DATE: 02.02.2026

Between:

Amal VT and another

.... Petitioners/
Accused Nos.3 and 4

AND

The State of Telangana,
Through P.S. Cyber Crime (Hqrs),
TGCSB, Rep by Public Prosecutor.

.... Respondent/
Complainant

O R D E R

This criminal petition is filed under Section 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioners/Accused Nos.3 & 4 seeking enlargement on bail in connection with Crime No.40 of 2025 of Cyber Crime Police Station, TSCSB. The offences alleged against the petitioners are under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 338 of BNS and 66-D of IT Act, 2000-2008.

2. The brief facts of the case are that, the *de-facto* complainant lodged a report with the police on 09.09.2025 stating that he was added to a WhatsApp group named “D2 High Network”, which was related to investments, by an unknown person named Sacha Sarda. He was referred to the website https://iiflcapital.top. One Sneha Sarda provided a demonstration of how the platform worked and persuaded him that the company would handle all the analysis, assuring him that all he needed to do was invest money into the trading account. Believing the same, he eventually invested a total of Rs.3,61,15,106/- over a period of 45 days. During this period, the account showed a total profit of approximately Rs.27 crores. When he attempted to withdraw the funds, customer care support informed him that he would need to pay a 1% commission on the profit. Upon contacting them further, he was instructed to pay 1% of the profit amount as Tax Collected at Source (TCS), allegedly payable to the Indian government. These conditions raised his suspicions, particularly regarding the legitimacy of the tax and withdrawal terms. On 02.09.2025, he visited the IIFL Securities office at Connaught Place, Ashoka Estate, where he discovered that Sneha was not employed there. The office staff informed him that it was a case of fraud and that the individual was not associated with their website. Consequently, the complainant requested the police to take necessary action.

Based on his complaint, a case was registered for the alleged offences.

3. Heard Sri M. Sai Prakash Goud, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri D. Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

4. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners is that the petitioners are innocent of the allegations and have been in judicial custody since 31.10.2025, i.e., for more than 90 days. He further submitted that the crucial part of the investigation has already been completed except for the filing of the charge sheet. Hence, he prayed the Court to grant bail to the petitioners.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions, contending that the allegations against the petitioners are heinous in nature, involving multiple victims who have been defrauded. He further submitted that the investigation is ongoing. Therefore, he prayed that the Court dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In light of the submissions made by both learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is evident that the petitioners have been in judicial custody since 31.10.2025. The alleged offences are punishable under Sections 318(4), 319(2),

338 of BNS and Section 66-D of the Information Technology Act, 2000–2008. As per the remand case diary, prosecution witnesses LWs.1 to 8, including the investigating authority, have already been examined. Despite the completion of 90 days, no charge sheet has been filed by the investigating authority. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the stage of investigation, and the duration of incarceration, this Court finds it appropriate to grant bail to the petitioners–Accused Nos.3 and 4, subject to the following conditions:

i. The petitioners shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only), with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned VI Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, at Nampally, Hyderabad.

ii. The petitioners shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 a.m., on every Wednesday for a period of eight (8) week or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier, for the purpose of investigation, and thereafter, as and when required.

iii. The petitioners shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of

Cr.P.C. (presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).

iv. The petitioners shall cooperate with the investigation and shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required.

v. The petitioners shall not threaten, influence, or induce any of the prosecution witnesses.

vi. The petitioners shall deposit their passports before the trial Court and they shall not leave the jurisdiction of the Court without prior permission of the trial Court.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 02.02.2026
SS

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.883 OF 2026

DATE : 02.02.2026

SS