

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT
HYDERABAD**

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.9148 of 2026

DATE: 25.06.2026

Between:

Kicha @ Pandra Rajyalakshmi

.... Petitioner/Accused No.2

AND

The State of Telangana,
its Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Hyderabad,
Through P.S.Nagole, Hyderabad.

.... Respondent/Complainant

: ORDER :

This criminal petition is filed under Sections 480 & 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 by the petitioner-accused No.2 praying to enlarge him on bail in connection with Crime No.155 of 2026 of Nagole Police Station, Malkajgiri Commissionerate. The offences alleged against the petitioner are under Sections 316(5), 318(4) r/w 3(5) of BNS and Sections 3 and 5 of the Telangana Protection of Depositors of Financial Establishments Act, 1999

2. The brief facts of the case are that the *de-facto* complainant lodged a complaint before police on 10.03.2026 stating that he on behalf of more than 270 victims alleging that the accused persons had induced the public to invest money in investment schemes operated under the names “Rao's Trading Group” and “VR Trading Services” by promising returns ranging from 10% to 16% and offering attractive commissions to agents and mediators. Based on such representations, more than 270 families invested an amount exceeding Rs.30 Crores. The accused persons allegedly collected the deposits through various bank accounts and subsequently stopped making payments from June–July, 2025 onwards and accused persons absconded after collecting the deposits and misappropriated the investors’ funds for their personal use including the purchase of vehicles, gold, other valuable assets, family functions and foreign educational expenses. Therefore, the *de-facto* complainant requested the police to take necessary action against the accused persons. Based on the said complaint, the police registered a case for the aforesaid offences.

3. Heard Sri M. Prudhvi Raju, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri D. Arun Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner, who is arrayed as Accused No.2, is the wife of Accused No.1 and is in no way connected with VR Trading Services. He submitted that the marriage between the petitioner and Accused No.1 was performed subsequent to the receipt of the alleged deposits and therefore, she had no role whatsoever in the commission of the alleged offence. He further submitted that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 01.04.2026, i.e., for more than 60 days and is suffering from a physical disability and that the investigation has been substantially completed. Therefore, he prayed this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail by allowing this criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the grant of bail, contending that although the marriage of the petitioner with Accused No.1 was solemnized prior to the collection of the deposits, the petitioner had actively participated in the commission of the offence even before the

marriage, being a relative of Accused No.1. He further contended that the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature and that a large number of victims have been affected by the acts of the accused persons. He further submitted that the investigating agency has not yet been able to trace and recover the proceeds of crime and, therefore, further custodial detention of the petitioner is necessary for the purpose of investigation and prayed that the present criminal petition be dismissed. However, he informed the Court that, as on date, no charge sheet has been filed.

6. Having considered the rival submissions made by both the learned counsel and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is evident that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 01.04.2026. As per the remand case diary, prosecution witnesses, namely LWs.1 to 35, including the investigating officer, have already been examined. Taking into consideration the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the progress of the investigation, the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner and the fact that no charge sheet has been filed till date, this Court is inclined to grant regular 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 I Additional District and Sessions Judge, Ranga Reddy District at L.B. Nagar.
 - ii. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned SHO between 09.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.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 483(2) of the BNSS.
8. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 25.06.2026

SS

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.9148 of 2026

Date: 25.06.2026

SS