

IN THE COURT OF THE SESSIONS JUDGE
Red Hills, Nampally, Hyderabad - 500004

Dated this the 06th day of August, 2026

Present: Smt K.Sai Rama Devi,
Sessions Judge,
Hyderabad.

BAIL CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS PETITION NO.3358/2026

IN

CRIME NO.242/2024 OF PS., SIT, CCS, DD, HYDERABAD

BETWEEN:

Pradeep Shiv Kumar Patil, S/o: Shiv Kumar Pundlik
Rao, Aged about 32 years, Occupation: Business,
R/o: Beside Vishal Mart, Moosapet, Hyderabad, N/
o: 1-103/1, Sunikini Shakti Meta Mandram, Kotagiri,
Sunkini, Nizamabad.

.....Petitioner/Accused No.1.

AND

The State of Telangana through PS., SIT, CCS, DD,
Hyderabad .

.....Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is filed by the petitioner through counsel under Section 483 of BNSS., praying that for the reasons stated therein to bail to the petitioner/accused No.1 in the above said case.

This petition is coming before me for hearing upon perusing the petition and upon hearing the arguments of M/s D.Raji Reddy, Advocate for the Petitioner/accused No.1 and of Smt T.Rajya Lakshmi, Public Prosecutor for Respondent/Complainant, this Court made the following:-

:: ORDER ::

1. This is the first bail petition filed under section 483 of BNSS seeking regular bail to the petitioner/A1 for the alleged offence under sections 318(4), 316(2) read with 61(2) of BNS, section 5 of TSPDFE Act and section 12 of TS Chit Fund Act.

2. The case of the prosecution in brief is that the defacto complainant/S.Nalini Reddy has lodged a complaint stating that she became acquainted with the petitioner/A1 and other accused along with their companies M/s.Kingpin Research & Wealth Management Pvt. Ltd., and Pradeep assets Management (OPC) Pvt. Ltd., and thereafter the respondents/accused lured the defacto complainant and other victims to deposit the

amounts and as such she invested an amount of Rs.15,50,000/- and later she came to know that over 250 investors had been defrauded and lost their investment amount of Rs.44 crores. Hence, the petitioner/A1 along with other accused have committed an offence punishable under sections 316(2), 318(4) read with 61(2) of BNS and section 5 of TSPDFE Act and section 12 of Chit Fund Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner/A1 in the petition submitted that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case without any involvement or knowledge of the alleged offence. It is further submitted that the provisions of the TSPDFE Act and the alleged offences under the BNS and the Telangana Chit Fund Act are not attracted to the facts of the case. It is stated that the investigation has been completed, all relevant documents and material evidence have already been seized, and the petitioner has cooperated with the investigation by undergoing police custody. It is further contended that his further custodial detention is not required, there is no likelihood of his absconding or tampering with the prosecution evidence, and he is ready to abide by any conditions imposed by the Court, including furnishing sufficient sureties and appearing before the Court as and when required. Hence, prayed to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor filed counter contending that the petitioner/A-1, along with the other accused, cheated the public to the tune of about Rs.44 crores by inducing investors with false promises of high returns. It is submitted that the investigation is at a crucial stage and the custodial interrogation of A-1 is essential to trace the money trail, verify transactions through various companies, bank accounts and trading platforms, identify the beneficiaries, recover incriminating documents, electronic devices, digital evidence, passwords and financial records, and ascertain the proceeds of crime. It is further contended that the investigation is also aimed at identifying and apprehending the remaining accused, verifying movable and immovable assets acquired from the diverted funds, obtaining specimen signatures and handwriting for forensic examination, and examining addi-

tional witnesses. It is argued that, if released on bail, the petitioner is likely to influence witnesses, tamper with evidence and hamper the ongoing investigation. It is also submitted that the police custody petition is pending before the Court. Hence, prayed to dismiss the petition.

5. Heard both sides. Perused the material on record.

6. Now, the point that arises for determination is "Whether the petitioner/A1 is entitled for grant of bail?"

POINT:-

7. Having considered the rival submissions and the material placed on record, this Court is of the view that the allegations against the petitioner are grave in nature involving large-scale financial fraud affecting several investors. The investigation is still in progress and substantial aspects, including tracing the money trail, recovery of documentary and digital evidence, and identification of other accused persons, are yet to be completed. At this stage, the possibility of the petitioner interfering with the investigation or influencing witnesses cannot be ruled out. Hence, this Court is not inclined to exercise its discretion in favour of the petitioner. Accordingly, the bail petition is dismissed.

8. In the result, the petition is dismissed

Typed on my dictation by the Stenographer Gr-I, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court, on this the 06th day of August, 2026.

Sd/-
SESSIONS JUDGE,
HYDERABAD.

DIS. NO. /2026/SJ/JW/HYD

DATED: -08-2026

Copy to:

- 1) The SHO., PS., SIT, CCS, DD, Hyderabad. (through PP)
- 2) The Counsel for the petitioner (on payment of usual charges)

//T.C.F.B.O//