IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.7995 of 2026

DATE: 09.06.2026

Between:

Mohammed Kaiser Ahmed Ansari

….. Petitioner/Accused No.1

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court at Hyderabad.

…..Respondent

: ORDER :

This Criminal Petition is filed before this Court for grant of bail to the Petitioner who is arrayed as accused No.1 in FIR No.118 of 2026 of Bhongir Town Police Station, Yadadri Bhuvanagiri District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 115(2), 351(2), 352, 61(2), 111 r/w 3(5) of the BNS and Section 5 of the Telangana Protection of Depositors of Financial Establishments Act.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 06.04.2026, the de-facto complainant lodged a report before the police stating that the petitioner had worked in Dubai for about 20 years after returning from Dubai, he came into contact with one Kaiser Ahmed Ansari and others through his friend, who induced him to invest money in their alleged iron and steel business under the name "K.A. Trading Company" by promising high returns within one year; believing the same, he invested Rs. 40,00,000/- through bank transactions, but the accused failed to repay the amount or profits even after the agreed period and though the accused later promised to repay about Rs. 7.25 Crores to all victims by 31.12.2025 and issued cheques, he failed to honour the same, and it is alleged that the accused along with his family members misappropriated the invested amounts by showing false investments in non-existing companies and diverted the funds for personal use, thereby committing offences of cheating, criminal breach of trust, misappropriation, assault, and criminal intimidation. Hence, he requested for taking necessary action. Basing on the said complaint, the police registered a case for the above said offences.

3. Heard Sri B. Sandeep Kumar, learned Senior counsel representing Sri K. Ravikanth, learned counsel for the Petitioner as well as Sri M. Ramachandra Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent - State.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the said allegations and in fact, the petitioner and the de-facto complainant are partners in the said company and there is no such deposit made by the complainant in the account of the petitioner and even according to the de-facto complainant, whatever, the amount invested in the business, is an investment in the business and it is not a deposit. Hence, the offence under Section 5 of the Telangana Protection of Depositors of Financial Establishments Act, 1999 is not applicable to the present case and he is in jail since 07.04.2026 and the entire investigation was already completed and as on today, no charge sheet is filed by the investigating authority. Therefore, he prayed the Court to grant bail to him by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner stating that it is a huge financial fraud and he lured number of victims. Further, the investigation is not yet completed and Rs.7.25 Crores is involved in this case and the investigating authority has to investigate with regard to the said amount, therefore, at this stage, he is not entitled for the bail and prayed the Court to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record, it appears that the petitioner herein is in jail since 07.04.2026 and as seen from the remand case diary, the prosecution witnesses, LWs 1 to 8 have already been examined. However, the document filed by the petitioner shows that the petitioner and the de-facto complainant are partners in the said company. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations, the stage of investigation and that the petitioner herein is in jail for a period of 60 days, this Court finds it appropriate to

grant bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:

i. The petitioner 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 Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate, Bhongir.

ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO at 11:00 a.m., on every Wednesday 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.

iii. The petitioner shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C. (presently, Section 480(3) of the BNSS).

7. Accordingly, the Criminal petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date :09.06.2026
TU

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.7995 OF 2026

DATE :09.06.2026

TU