IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.5421 OF 2026

DATE : 20.04.2026

Between :

Smt.Perla Sri Vidya
W/o Perala Srinivas Rao.

… Petitioner/A.2

And

The State of Telangana,
Through Station House Officer,
Adilabad II-Town Police Station,
Adilabad District, Telangana,
Rep., by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court at Hyderabad

… Respondent

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused No.2 in FIR No.160 of 2026 of Adilabad II-Town Police Station, Adilabad District. The offences alleged against the petitioner are punishable under Section 420 of Indian Penal Code and under Section 5 of the Telangana Protection of Depositors and Financial Establishment Act, 1999 (for short 'TSPDFEA Act').

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 04.03.2026 at about 2000 hours, the complainant lodged a report stating that the management of Akshara Chit Fund Pvt. Ltd, headed by Chairman Perala Srinivas, induced the complainant that if he pays Rs.10,000/- on monthly installment basis for 50 months he would get huge amount in the form of chit. Accordingly, the complainant paid from Rs.6,500/- to Rs.10,000/- for 34 months. Late on 28.02.2024 he withdrew the amount of Rs.4,24,000/-. Thereafter, the complainant came to know that the management of Akshara chit fund pvt Ltd, Hanmkonda Chairman, Director and other Directors, Managers of the said Chit Fund Company did not return his money though he visited Hanmakonda main branch many time and hence, cheated him. Hence, he requested the police to take necessary action against the petitioner. Basing on the same, police registered a case for the aforesaid offences.

3. Heard Sri Saini Aravind, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Sri M.Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent - State.

4. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case

without any specific allegation or overt act, and her name was added subsequently only after her arrest in other similar cases, indicating *mala fide* intention. It is contended that no notice was issued to the petitioner before her arrest and she was brought into the present case only through a PT warrant while in judicial custody in other crimes, without any independent material or remand in this case. The complaint contains only vague and general allegations against the company and does not attribute any specific role, inducement, or transaction to the petitioner, thereby not satisfying the ingredients of offences under Sections 420 of IPC. It is further contended that the petitioner was only a nominal Director for a limited period, had no role in the day-to-day affairs of the company, and had resigned from all directorships much prior to the alleged transactions. Hence, vicarious criminal liability cannot be fastened on her in the absence of specific allegations. The invocation of the provisions of the TSPDFEA Act is also misconceived, as the transactions relate to chit fund activities governed by the Chit Funds Act, 1982 and do not constitute "deposits." He further submitted that the cases arise out of financial difficulties faced during the COVID-19 period due to large-scale defaults by subscribers, and the disputes are essentially civil in nature, which have been wrongly given a criminal colour. It is also argued that multiple FIRs have been registered for identical allegations in violation of Section 242 BNSS, and the arrest is illegal for non-compliance with statutory safeguards under Section 35(3) BNSS and the law laid down in **Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar**[1] **and Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI & another**[2]. Therefore, in the absence of specific allegations, considering her prior resignation, the documentary nature of the case, and prolonged custody, the petitioner is entitled to be enlarged on bail. Hence, prayed this Court to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed bail stating that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. The petitioner herein is also an active member in the alleged crime. The accused under the guise of deposit schemes induced innocent people to invest substantial amounts with promise of high returns. The petitioner herein is also one of the Directors of company and deposits were mobilized during her tenure and the funds were diverted for their personal use. Investigation is not yet completed and several victims are involved in this case. As such, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much

---

[1] (2014) 8 SCC 273
[2] (2022) 10 Supreme Court Cases 51

required. Hence, petitioner is not entitled to bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Considering the submissions made by both the counsel and the material on record, the petitioner herein is in jail from 14.02.2026. A.1 is the Director of company and the petitioner herein is also one of the Director and wife of A.1. Considering the allegations against the petitioner and the period of her incarceration, this Court deems it fit to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed, granting bail to the petitioner, and the conditions and sureties imposed in Crl.P.No.3859 of 2026, vide order dated 01.04.2026, shall apply to the present case in which the petitioner has been granted bail.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 20.04.2026
YVL

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

<u>CRIMINAL PETITION No.5421 OF 2026</u>

<u>Date: 20.04.2026</u>

YVL