IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.8308 and 8370 of 2026

DATE : 18.06.2026

Between:

Thakur Karan Singh and another

...Petitioners-accused Nos.1 and 5

AND

The State of Telangana.

...Respondent

COMMON ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, "BNSS"), seeking grant of anticipatory bail.

2. The petitioners are arrayed as Accused Nos.1 and 5 in Crime Nos.8 of 2026 and 23 of 2026 on the file of the Penchikalpet Town Police Station and Kagaznagar Town Police Station, Kumarambheem Asifabad District, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406 read with 34 of Indian Penal Code and Section 5 of the Telangana Protection Of Depositors Of Financial Establishments Act, 1999.

3. Since the petitioners and issues involved in both the Criminal Petitions are substantially similar and arise out of analogous facts and circumstances, they were heard together and are being disposed of by this common order.

4. Heard Mr.Verose Sanjana, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.Vivekananda Reddy, learned Additional Public Prosecutor representing the respondent-State and perused the material available on record.

5. The prosecution case, in brief, is that accused No.4, who is the daughter of petitioner No.1 and the sister of LW/PW No.4, had established a business concern under the name and style M/s. Devine Group of Company and, along with the present petitioners, allegedly induced the de facto complainant and others to invest money in a purported share market business by assuring returns at the rate of 5% per month on the investments made. Believing such representations, the de facto complainant is stated to have invested amounts of Rs.10,00,000/- and Rs.40,00,000/-, while he and his associates together invested a sum of approximately Rs.1.08 crores. It is alleged that the accused initially paid certain returns to the investors, thereby creating confidence in the scheme, but subsequently defaulted in making further payments and failed to refund the invested amounts despite repeated demands made by the de facto complainant and other investors. Aggrieved thereby, the de facto complainant lodged a complaint, on the basis of which the present crimes came to be registered.

6.1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated merely because of their close familial relationship with accused No.4, who is the proprietor of the said concern. It is contended that petitioner No.1 is a septuagenarian and is stated to be suffering from psychiatric ailments requiring continuous medical attention. Learned counsel submits that accused No.4, without the knowledge or active participation of petitioner No.1, allegedly utilized his bank account for receiving certain amounts from investors. Insofar as petitioner No.2 is concerned, it is contended that there are no specific allegations attributing any overt act to him except a general allegation that he had promoted or encouraged the business activities of accused No.4.

6.2. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioners are ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation, to appear before the Investigating Officer whenever required, and to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that in other cases arising out of substantially similar allegations against the petitioners, involving offences punishable under Sections 406 and 420 of the *Indian Penal Code, 1860*, this Court had directed the Investigating Officer to follow the mandate contemplated under Section 35(3) of the BNSS and that the petitioners have scrupulously complied with the conditions imposed therein. Learned counsel would submit that the principal allegations concerning collection and management of investments are specifically directed against accused No.4, who has already been arrested and remanded to judicial custody. Having regard to the advanced age and medical condition of petitioner No.1, the absence of any specific allegations warranting custodial interrogation and the willingness of the petitioners to cooperate with the investigation, learned counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

7. Per contra, learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the petitions contending that the petitioners, though family members of accused No.4, had actively associated themselves with the business activities conducted by her and had induced the de facto complainant and other investors to part with substantial sums of money by assuring attractive monthly returns. It is submitted that, as per the material collected during investigation, the investments were made on the strength of such assurances and that amounts received from investors were credited into the bank account maintained in the name of petitioner No.1. It is further contended that several similar crimes are stated to be pending against the petitioners and that the investigation is still at a preliminary stage. According to the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, grant of anticipatory bail at this stage may affect the progress of investigation and prejudice the prosecution case. Accordingly, dismissal of the petitions is sought.

8. I have considered the rival submissions and have carefully perused the material on record.

9. The consistent stand of the petitioners is that they have been implicated solely by reason of their relationship with accused No.4 and that they neither participated in the alleged investment scheme nor induced any person to invest money therein. On the other hand, the prosecution asserts that the petitioners had actively participated in the activities of the concern and that monies invested by the de facto complainant and other investors were credited into the bank account of petitioner No.1.

10. Be that as it may, having regard to the nature of the allegations, the advanced age of petitioner No.1, the assertion regarding his medical condition, and the fact that the transactions complained of were admittedly effected through banking channels and are, therefore, capable of being independently verified from documentary records, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners does not appear to be indispensable at this stage of investigation. Significantly, the prosecution has not pointed out any specific circumstance indicating that the petitioners are likely to abscond, evade the due process of law, tamper with documentary evidence, or influence witnesses. The petitioners have also expressed their unequivocal willingness to cooperate with the investigation.

11. Thus in the facts of the present case, and balancing the need for a fair and effective investigation with the petitioners' fundamental right to personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this Court is satisfied that the petitioners have made out a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

12. Accordingly, these Criminal Petitions are allowed. The petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 5 shall be enlarged on anticipatory bail in Crime Nos.08 of 2026 and 23 of 2026 on the file of the Penchikalpet Town Police Station and Kagaznagar Town Police Station, Kumarambheem Asifabad District, subject to the following conditions.

(A) The petitioners/accused Nos.1 and 5 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Penchikalpet Town and Kagaznagar Town, on or before 03.07.2026. Upon such surrender or on arrest, the Station House

Officer shall release the petitioners on bail on each of them executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousan only) with two sureties for a like sum each, to the satisfaction of the said officer.

(B) The petitioners shall appear before the Investigating Officer every Thursday between 09:00 a.m. to 05:00 p.m. for a period of twelve (12) weeks from the date of his release on bail and shall cooperate with the investigation in all respects.

(C) The petitioners shall furnish their complete residential address, mobile numbers and other contact particulars to the Investigating Officer and shall promptly intimate any change therein.

(D) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly induce, threaten, influence, or promise any person acquainted with the facts of the case, nor shall they tamper with prosecution evidence in any manner whatsoever.

13. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

N.TUKARAMJI, J

Date: 18.06.2026

mmr

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos.8308 and 8370 of 2026

DATE : 18.06.2026

mmr