IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.6508 OF 2026

DATE : 01.05.2026

Between:

Kicha Tejaswini

….Petitioner/A.6

AND

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Telangana at Hyderabad,
Through P.S.Nagole- Malkajgiri District

…..Respondent/
Defacto complainant

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking the Court to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner/A.6 in the event of her arrest in connection with FIR No.829 of 2025 of Nagole Police Station, Malkajgiri District. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 316(5), 318(4) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS').

2. The facts of the case are that on 02.12.2025 at about 16:00 hours, a complaint was received from D.Bhagyalaxmi, stating that she was filing the complaint on behalf of more than 270 victims against the accused persons namely Kicha Veerabhadra Rao, P. Rajyalaxmi, John Wesley Talluri, Kicha Tejaswini, Karri Veera Venkata Durga Vara Prasad, Kicha Vamsi Priya and few others, who allegedly collected huge amounts of money from innocent people and the said money was transferred amongst their family members in the name of fake companies called RTG Company and VR Trading Services through Ponzi and illegal investment schemes. The main accused, Kicha Veerabhadra Rao, resident of Rajiv Swagruha Apartments, Bandlaguda/Nagole, Hyderabad, allegedly promised monthly returns of 10% to 16% and also offered commissions to mediators and agents who brought investors into the scheme. Believing these promises, more than 270 families, mostly poor and middle-class persons, invested their hard-earned money, including funds raised through loans and chits, amounting to more than Rs.30 crores. The accused collected deposits through various bank accounts in the names

of VR Trading Services and Kicha Veerabhadra Rao. Payments to investors were allegedly stopped from June-July 2025, after which the accused absconded and started avoiding the victims. It is further alleged that the accused used a fake SEBI certificate to falsely project himself as a certified trader, thereby cheating investors. The complaint further states that the collected funds were diverted for personal use, including lavish family functions, marriage expenses, foreign education in Russia, purchase of vehicles, gold, and other properties. It is also alleged that some of the accused were previously involved in similar offences, including FIR No.251 of 2025 under Section 420 IPC and Section 66-D of the Information Technology Act, and FIR No.17 of 2018 with CC No.418 of 2022 under Section 420 IPC. Hence, the complainant requested legal action against the accused persons. Basing on the said complaint, the police registered the case against the accused for the above offences.

3. Heard Sri M.Prudhvi Raju, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri M.Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent – State.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner is in no way connected with the alleged transactions and has not carried on any business with the de facto complainant. It is submitted that she did not receive any amount from the complainant and that false and vague allegations have been made only to implicate her in the case. It is further argued that even according to the prosecution, she is not a director or person responsible for the affairs of the alleged company, and that she has been implicated only because she is a relative of A.1. The learned counsel further submitted that the police conducted only a preliminary enquiry and registered the case without any material against her, solely to harass her by way of arrest. It is also contended that the petitioner is a native of Hyderabad, has a permanent residence and landed property, and therefore there is no possibility of her absconding. The petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate with the investigating officer and to appear before the trial Court as and when required. It is lastly submitted that petitioner is willing to furnish suitable sureties and abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, prayed this Court to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed bail contending that there are 13 accused in this case. The petitioner, along with the other accused, induced the victims to invest money by promising high returns of 10% to 20% per month. It is submitted that the accused collected huge amounts, approximately Rs.30 crores, from more than 270 investors and cheated them. He also contended that the accused diverted the collected funds to their personal accounts. However, he informed the Court that no other cases are pending against the petitioner. Hence, petitioner is not entitled to bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Considering the submissions made by the respective counsel and the material placed on record, the petitioner herein is arrayed as A.6 and she is the daughter of A.1 residing in Russia from 2024. However, the allegations show that from 2025, A.1 has not paid the amount to defacto complainant. Further allegation is that with the crime proceeds, the petitioner was sent to Russia for studies and the petitioner herein is also luring Indians at Russia to deposit amounts in V.R.Trading Services. However, this Court observes that the petitioner is not in India at the time of offence i.e., in the year 2025 from

when the payments were stopped to the victim. Considering the allegations against the petitioner and as the petitioner is not in India on the date of offence, this Court deems it appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions:

i. The petitioner shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Nagole Police Station, Malkajgiri District within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release the petitioner on bail on her executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties, for the like sum each.

ii. The petitioner shall appear before the SHO concerned between 09.00 a.m and 05.00 p.m., on every Monday for a period of eight (8) weeks, for the purpose of investigation or till filing of charge sheet whichever is earlier and thereafter, as and when required.

iii. The petitioner 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 applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 01.05.2026
Lrkm

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.6508 OF 2026

Date: 01.05.2026

Lrkm