IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.5757 of 2026

DATE: 28.04.2026

BETWEEN:

C.S. Bharath and another

….. Petitioners/A.3 & 4

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep. through Station House Officer,
Central Crime Station, DD, Hyderabad.
Rep. by the Public Prosecutor,
High Court for the State of Telangana,
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 petitioners, who are arrayed as accused Nos.3 and 4 in Crime No.69 of 2026 before the Central Crime Station, Hyderabad, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4) and 319(2) read with 61(2) of BNS.

2. The brief facts of the case are that, on 26.03.2026, the de-facto complainant, who is authorized representative of M/s.ANS Engineerings lodged a report before the Police stating that he was introduced to one Gagan Deep N., who falsely projected himself as Regional Head (CSR) of Infosys Technologies Limited and offered CSR-based government school construction projects in Karnataka. Believing the representations, the complainant visited Bengaluru, inspected multiple government schools, and agreed to undertake the project. Acting on instructions of Gagan Deep N., he paid Rs.3 crore as Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) through demand drafts in favor of Anitha Ventures, represented by CS Bharath and Sreenivasa Reddy R.V.. Subsequently, based on further assurances and meetings with officials, including a conference allegedly attended by Karnataka ministers and government officers, the project scope was enhanced. The accused induced the complainant to pay an additional Rs.1 crore (part of a demanded Rs.9.5 crore EMD) under the pretext of securing the expanded project. The accused continued to assure execution of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and issued documents such as offer letters and a Letter of Award. Additional persons, including Neeladri and Harish, were also projected as involved in the process to gain credibility. On 03.04.2026, the complainant discovered through a news report that similar fraud had been committed by

the same accused against another company, revealing that Gagan Deep N. had impersonated an Infosys official and cheated multiple parties. The complainant alleges that he was fraudulently induced to part with a total of Rs.4 crore under false pretenses. As such, he requested for necessary legal action against Gagan Deep N., Anitha Ventures and its representatives, and others. Based on the same, a crime was registered against the accused for the above mentioned offences.

3. Heard Sri D. Prakash Reddy, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of Sri N. Naveen Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners, Sri Phanindra Pavan Kashyap, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2 and Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent–State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are in no way connected with the alleged offences, except for the limited circumstance that Accused No.1 had handed over Demand Drafts in the name of their firm, which were subsequently encashed by them and that there are no specific allegations that the petitioners induced or deceived the de facto complainant or caused any wrongful loss to him. On the contrary, the petitioners themselves were misled by Accused No.1, who

approached them claiming to be the Regional Head and Director in charge of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) activities of Infosys Limited, and invited them to its office for preliminary discussions regarding a proposed transaction. He further submitted that during such discussions, Accused No. 1 represented that he would facilitate the transaction and also arrange financial support for pre-contractual deposits. Believing such representations to be genuine, the petitioners acted in good faith and consequently became victims at the hands of Accused No. 1 and that the petitioners are ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation and have, in fact, themselves brought to the notice of the authorities the registration of a similar crime in Karnataka, which demonstrates their bona fides and absence of any criminal intent. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioners by allowing the criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No.2 vehemently opposed the bail application contending that the petitioners cannot plead innocence, inasmuch as they admittedly received and encashed the Demand Drafts without due verification, which clearly indicates their active involvement and complicity in the fraudulent scheme, in collusion with Accused No.1. He further submitted that the accused persons, from the very inception, acted

with dishonest intention and in furtherance of a criminal conspiracy, thereby inducing the de facto complainant to part with substantial amounts of money, resulting in grave financial loss and irreparable injury. Hence, he prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the petition by contending that the allegations against the petitioners are grave and serious in nature and that the bank account statements of the petitioners reflect that an amount of approximately Rs.4 crores, received between May 2025 and August 2025, has already been utilized, and there is no remaining balance in the account. He further submitted that the funds initially obtained from the defacto complainant were routed through the petitioners' accounts as part of the process of laundering or tracing criminal proceeds. Therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is stated to be necessary for a proper and effective investigation and that, if granted anticipatory bail, the petitioners may influence witnesses or tamper with evidence, as such prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

7. In light of the submissions made by both learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is noted that the allegations against the petitioners are punishable under

Sections 318(4) and 319(2) read with Section 61(2) of BNS and the record *prima facie* indicates that Accused No.1 is alleged to have cheated the de facto complainant to a substantial extent, and part of the amounts, including a sum of ₹4 crores, were received in the account of M/s Anitha Ventures. However, considering that the present petition is one for anticipatory bail and that the offences alleged are punishable with imprisonment for a term less than seven years, and further taking into account the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of allegations, and the documents placed on record, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not necessary at this stage. Hence, this Court deems it appropriate to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

i. The petitioners shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Central Crime Station, Hyderabad within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Court shall release them on bail on executing a personal bond for Rs.1,00,000/- each with two sureties, for the like sum each.

ii. The petitioners 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 petitioners shall appear before the concerned Investigating Officer on every Wednesday between 09:00 a.m, and 05:00 p.m. for a period of eight (8) weeks or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier, for the purpose of investigation, and thereafter, as and when required.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 28.04.2026
SS

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.5757 of 2026

Date: 28.04.2026
SS