IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

<u>CRIMINAL PETITION No.6619 of 2026</u>

DATE: 01.05.2026

Between:

T. Pavani Kumari and another.

.... Petitioners/accused Nos.2 and 4

AND

The State of Telangana,
Through EOW CID PS, Hyderabad,
Rep. by the Public Prosecutor
High Court Building, Hyderabad – 500 066.

.... Respondent

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.2 and 4, in Crime No.300 of 2021 of Kachiguda Police station, now with EOW CID Police Station, Hyderabad City Police. The offences alleged against the petitioners are under Sections 406, 409, 420 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') and under Section 5 of Protection of the Telangana Depositors of Financial Establishment Act, 1999.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 22.09.2021 a complaint was lodged by Mr.Vemula Chennaiah before the Police, wherein it is stated that in the year 2018, while he was working in ICICI (Fino), he came into contact with his friend Sudheer, who informed him about a job opportunity in Mudra Agriculture and Skill Development Multistate Co-operative Society Limited at Kothakota Branch as an Accountant. Thereafter, through Sudheer, he was introduced to one Mallesh, who represented himself as RM and stated that the society was affiliated to the Central Government and would soon be converted into a banking sector. It is further stated that the complainant resigned from his private job and met P. Krishna (Director of the Society) through Mallesh, and thereafter met Thippaneni Ramadasappa Naidu, Chairman of the Society, at Barkatpur Office. The complainant was offered the post of Manager at Nawabpet Branch and was asked to pay Rs.2,00,000/- towards development of the society. Accordingly, he paid the said amount as investment and an investment bond was issued assuring return after two years with 0.70% interest.

An appointment letter was issued on 16.10.2018. It is further alleged that P. Krishna and Mallesh collected Rs.50,000/- as brokerage. It is also stated that the complainant worked in the society for two years and was paid salary of Rs.14,000/- per month, out of which deductions were made towards PF and ESI and the balance amount was credited through NEFT. Subsequently, due to alleged poor performance and lack of development in the society, salary payments were delayed. Thereafter, the complainant resigned and requested refund of his investment amount along with interest; however the accused allegedly delayed payment and switched off their phones. It is further alleged that the society similarly cheated several unemployed persons in Telangana and Andhra Pradesh by representing that it was affiliated to the Government. The complainant also cited investments made by his friends, namely Satyanarayana Reddy (Rs.1,80,000/-), S. Chandramoulu (Rs.2,00,000/-), G. Ravi Kumar (Rs.1,50,000/-), B. Karthik (Rs.3,00,000/-), and K. Shivashanker (Rs.1,00,000/-), along with brokerage of Rs.50,00/- each, totaling Rs.16,70,000/-. Basing on the said complaint, the Police registered a case and took up investigation.

3. Heard Sri Syed Ahmed, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri M. Ramachander Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the respondent – State.

4. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioners is that petitioner No.1 who is A.2 delivered a baby boy on 30.05.2025 and had C-section to her; that the doctors suggested petitioner No.1 six months of bed rest. It is further submitted that she is presently taking care of infant baby age about two months and another child age $2^{1/2}$ of years and both of whom are entire dependent on her. There are no specific allegations against this petitioner No.1 except that she is a daughter of accused No.1 and already accused Nos.1 and 3 (i.e. her father and brother are already in judicial custody). Therefore, custodial interrogation of petitioner No.1/accused Nos.2 is not necessary. Further it is submitted that petitioner No.2 who is accused No.4 is the wife of A.1 has also been falsely implicated in the case and there are no specific allegations against her. Hence, prayed this Court to grant anticipatory bail to these petitioners/accused Nos.2 and 4.

5. On the other hand learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the same stating that the petitioners herein are also actively involved in the commission of an offence there are specific allegations against these petitioners also. A.2 and A.4 being the family members of A.1 where involved in the activities of society, from its inception with dishonest intention and also actively participated in siphoning off funds collected from the general public and innocent unemployed youth. A.2 and A4 has misappropriated an amount of Rs.65,08,509/- and an amount of Rs.10,36,332/- of the society's funds by diverting the same to their respective personal bank accounts. In a view of seriousness of the allegations and their active role in the commission of an offence the petitioners are not entitled to bail and prayed to dismiss this petition.

6. Upon considering the submissions made by the leaned counsel for petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecution as well as the material placed on record, this Court observes that the contention of petitioner No.1/accused No.2 is that she has delivered a baby boy and the relevant documents are filed in support of the same and considering the health condition and fact that she is required to take care of infant baby, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner No.1/A.2. With regard to the petitioner No.2/accused No.4 it is observed that she is a wife of A.1 and the main allegations are against A.1 who is already in judicial custody. The main allegations are against the accused No.1. As such, this Court deems it appropriate to grant bail to the petitioner Nos.1 and 2/A.2 and A.4 subject to the following conditions:

i. The petitioners/A.2 and A.4 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, now EOW CID TG, Hyderabad, within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release the petitioners on bail on their executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty five thousand only) each with two sureties, for the like sum each.

ii. The petitioners/A.2 and A.4 shall appear before the concerned SHO between 10:00 AM and 05:00 PM on every Wednesday for a period of eight (8) weeks or till the filing of charge sheet, whichever is earlier for the purpose of investigation and thereafter, as and when required.

iii. The petitioners/A.2 and A.4 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 petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date :01.05.2026.
FM

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.6619 of 2026

Date: 01.05.2026
FM