





current account No.30252659825 in the name of the petitioner in the ordinary course.

2. Brief facts of the petitioner's case are that, W.P.No.794 of 2011 was filed by Sri P.Shankar Rao, the then MLA, Secunderabad Cantonment and W.P.No.6604 of 2011 was filed by Sri K.Yerrannaidu, Ex-MP and two others, seeking a direction to the CBI to register a crime against the petitioner company and others on the allegations that the Government of Andhra Pradesh headed by the then Chief Minister during the years 2004 to 2009, conferred large scale infrastructure projects worth thousands of crores, mining leases, vast extents of lands etc., on a few selected persons and such persons and their companies made huge investments into the companies owned and controlled by the son of the then Chief Minister in Quid Pro Quo.

a. While disposing of these cases, this Court directed the Central Bureau of Investigation for registration and thorough investigation in all the aspects as to financial misdeeds involving huge magnitude of government largesse, corporate dealings including huge investments as part of Quid Pro Quo



arrangement for the largesse and the benefit obtained by the investors from the State of Andhra Pradesh and also in other aspects.

b. As per the orders of this Court in W.P.Nos.794 and 6604 of 2011, dated 10.08.2011, the Central Bureau of Investigation registered a case in RC.No.19(A)/2011-C.B.I./HYD on 17.08.2011 under Sections 120-B, 409, 477-A of IPC and Sections 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(c) & (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and investigated into.

c. During the course of investigation, the CBI issued proceedings as per the provisions contemplated under Section 102 of Cr.P.C., for freezing of certain bank accounts of the petitioner company i.e. M/s.Jagati Publications Limited and two other companies i.e. M/s.Indira Television Ltd., and M/s.Janani Infrastructure Pvt.Ltd.,. The said proceedings were challenged in CrI.M.P.Nos.1001, 1002 and 1004 of 2012 in C.C.No.8 of 2012 seeking a direction to defreeze the account maintained in State Bank of India, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad branch and Oriental Bank of Commerce, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad and Indian Overseas Bank, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad to enable the



petitioner companies to carry on its day to day business without any hindrance in the interest of justice.

d. The learned Principal Special Judge for CBI Cases, Hyderabad vide common order dated 14.05.2012 dismissed the petitions, rejecting the prayer to defreeze the bank accounts.

e. Aggrieved by the said orders, CrI.P.No.4523 of 2012 was filed by the petitioner company and two other petitions i.e. CrI.P.Nos.4524 and 4525 of 2012 were filed by its sister concerns namely M/s.Janani Infrastructure Limited and M/s.Indira Television Limited. Along with the said petitions, they filed CrI.M.P.Nos.4520, 4521 and 4522 of 2012 seeking interim order directing the respondent to defreeze the accounts forthwith. This Court vide common order dated 23.05.2012 in CrI.M.P.Nos.4520, 4521 and 4522 of 2012 in Criminal Petition Nos.4523, 4524 and 4525 of 2012 allowed the prayer of the petitioner subject to furnishing bank guarantee for the total sum lying in the current accounts which have been freezed by the CBI.



f. Subsequently, the petitioner and the said sister concerns have filed CrI.M.P.Nos.4843, 4844 and 4845 of 2012 seeking modification of the common order dated 23.05.2012. This Court vide common order dated 06.07.2012, relaxed the earlier order dated 23.05.2012 with a direction to furnish bank guarantee for half of the amount lying in the current accounts and on further condition of furnishing security by depositing title deeds of any immovable properties of the petitioners worth more than Rs.5.00 crores to the satisfaction of Principal Special Judge for CBI Cases, Hyderabad and that the respondent/CBI shall defreeze the current accounts of the petitioner company and two other entities.

g. Further it is to be noted that another set of Criminal M.Ps were filed vide CrI.M.P.Nos.5543, 5587 and 5703 of 2012 in CrI.P.No.4523 of 2012 AND CrI.M.P.No.5544 of 2012 in CrI.P.No.4524 of 2012 AND CrI.M.P.No.5545 of 2012 in CrI.P.No.4525 of 2012, seeking modification of the conditions imposed by this Court and this Court vide common order dated 08.08.2012 dismissed the applications, strictly directing the petitioner to transact only through the 19 current accounts held



by the petitioner with State Bank of India branches in different locations.

h. It is the case of the petitioner that they earlier held 19 other current accounts in various locations maintained with Canara Bank and have been subsequently closed. Further, the petitioner was directed not to open any account in any bank without the prior permission of the Court and the CBI was directed to inform all the banks not to open any accounts or to operate any other/existing bank accounts other than the accounts covered by the orders of this Court.

i. This Court vide common order dated 01.11.2021 has disposed of the main criminal petitions i.e. CrI.P.Nos.4523, 4524 and 4525 of 2012 making the interim order dated 23.05.2012 as absolute.

j. While so, the petitioner being a newspaper publication company engaged in printing and circulation of one of the most widely circulated Telugu dailies (Sakshi) in both Telangana and Andhra Pradesh, involving large workforce across its editorial, printing, circulation and distribution wings, faced problems in its



regular course of its business. It is contended by the petitioner that as a part of its regular course of business, it has imported standard newsprint papers through West Asia Network DMCC, having its office at Dubai, UAE and that such imports form the backbone of the petitioner's daily operations. Under four separate purchase orders, the petitioner purchased an aggregate quantity of 1,412.08 metric tonnes of standard newsprint paper valued upto 8,04,885.653 (United States Dollars Eight Lakh Four Thousand Eight Hundred Eighty-Five and Cents Six Hundred Fifty-Three only). Out of the said four purchase orders, the petitioner initially sought to process the payment only in respect of one consignment covered under the invoice No.WAN/2025/08 dated 05.01.2025 for a quantity of 409.958 metric tonnes valued at USD 2,33,676.06 (United States Dollars Two Lakh Thirty-Three Thousand Six Hundred Seventy-Six and Cents Six only). For this purpose, necessary instructions were given to the Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Banjara Hills Branch vide letter dated 02.04.2025, to debit the Current Account No.30252659825 maintained by the petitioner for remitting payment to the said supplier. Despite submission of complete documentation, the petitioner received



intimation from the supplier that the payment has not been realized, and on enquiry the State Bank of India has informed that the transaction was withheld owing to lack of requisite approvals and the applicability of American and EU sanctions on Russia.

k. The further case of the petitioner is that the petitioner has addressed a detailed email dated 25.04.2025 to the SBI expressing concern over the non-processing of the remittance, clarifying that while the goods originated from Russia, the contractual entity was UAE based. It was further pointed out that, other Indian publications have been permitted to carry on similar transactions through public sector banks such as Bank of Baroda or private sector banks such as HDFC bank. Thus, the grievance of the petitioner is that non-payment was disrupting its production schedule and causing severe operational and reputational loss. Therefore, another reminder email dated 16.05.2025 was sent after twenty days of silence from SBI.

l. The petitioner has received an email dated 09.06.2025 from the Private Secretary to the Chief General Manager, SBI



stating that pursuant to the sanction advisories issued by US/EU and other jurisdictions, the Bank's policy on Russian related trade transactions was revised with effect from 17.08.2024. Only the transactions in food, agriculture, medicine, energy and telecommunications sectors were permitted. Since the goods originated from Russia (Kondopoga PPM JSC, St.Petersburg), import of newsprint was deemed outside the allowable sectors. It was stated that each bank follows its own internal policy and approval and as per the policy of SBI, the said transaction could not be granted. Thus, the petitioner lodged the complaint before the Reserve Bank of India but no redress was afforded. The petitioner thereafter submitted a detailed representation dated 16.09.2025 to the State Bank of India, pointing out that, by virtue of this Courts directions, all transactions must be routed only through the designated SBI accounts, and that Bank's refusal was paralyzing the petitioner's business operations.

m. In pursuance, the petitioner received a communication dated 07.11.2025 from the Office of the Banking Ombudsman, Reserve Bank of India, informing that the complaint filed



against SBI has been treated as not-maintainable on the ground that it pertains to a commercial decision of regulated entity. In view of the said communication, the petitioner has been rendered remediless before the regulating authority and is therefore, constrained to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court in the present petition.

3. The respondent/CBI filed counter opposing the petition. It is contended that under the guise of seeking modification of the order, the petitioner is seeking entirely new and multiple reliefs. Thus, none of the prayers sought by the petitioner are maintainable under 528 of BNSS, either on facts or on legal aspects. It is further contended that during the pendency of the main criminal petition i.e. CrI.P.No.4523 of 2012, several directions were issued by this Court and finally the petition was disposed of on 23.05.2012 making the orders dated 23.05.2012 absolute till the termination of proceedings in C.C.No.8 of 2012. Thus, when the main petition i.e. 4523 of 2012 has been disposed of by its orders dated 01.11.2011 it is not permissible to file successive applications in a disposed of matter and the only remedy that lies is to file an appeal before



the Apex Court in case if the petitioner intends to seek any further relief in the matter that is already disposed of. The present petition is filed as an Interlocutory Application (in short 'IA'), but the petitioner intends to seek a substantive modification of the judgment of this Hon'ble Court in an other way and that such an attempt is not permissible in an IA and thus, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

a. It is further contended by the respondent that the petitioner company herein has not challenged the final order in CrI.Petition No.4523, 4524 and 4525 of 2012 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and therefore, the said orders have attained finality. Thus, in case if it is aggrieved by the final orders, the petitioner company ought to have preferred SLP before the Supreme Court but instead the petitioner company chose to file the instant IA after a delay of 4764 days under the guise of modification which tantamounts to review under Section 362 of Cr.P.C. and that Section 362 of Cr.P.C. does not empower the Court to alter or review the same except to correct a clerical or arithmetical error once it has signed its judgment or final order disposing of a case.



b. It is further contended by the respondent that the relief sought in the present IA involves a substantial relaxation of the earlier conditions imposed by this Court rather than a clerical correction. That, any remedy, if available, must be pursued through a fresh and independent petition before the learned trial Court, where the subject C.C.No.8 of 2012 has been pending or by a fresh petition invoking High Court's inherent jurisdiction rather than by re-opening a disposed of matter. It is further contended that the petitioner company seeks permission to open and operate a new current account for the purpose of facilitating import-related remittances, citing alleged operational difficulties with State Bank of India arising out of the sanction-related issues. Thus the said grounds relate purely to the petitioner's commercial and banking exigencies and have no nexus whatsoever with the allegations in C.C.No.8 of 2012. The said restrictions imposed by this Court in 2012 were intended only to regulate the financial dealings of the petitioner during the pendency of the investigation and trial. It is contended that, the statutory bar under Section 362 Cr.P.C. continues to operate rendering the present IA not maintainable. Further, the grievance of the petitioner company concerns



banking and commercial issues arising from SBI's internal commercial decision which falls outside the scope of C.C.No.8 of 2012. Further it is contended that the SBI is not impleaded as a party despite being the necessary party and that the relief sought cannot be entertained in a disposed of petition or in the absence of the proper and necessary party and that the application is defective both in law and the procedure. The prayer in the present petition amounts to altering a final order and the inherent powers cannot be invoked for such relief.

c. It is also contended that on an earlier occasion Crl.M.P.Nos.5543, 5587 and 5703 of 2012 in Crl.P.No.4523 of 2012 were filed with a prayer to relax the conditions imposed by this Court and all these petitions have been dismissed by this Court by the order dated 08.08.2012 on exemplary costs of Rs.1,00,000/- for each petition and it was observed by this Court that there was a direction by this Court to the petitioner not to open any bank accounts in any bank without prior permission of the Court and further the CBI was directed to inform all the banks not to open any new bank accounts or to operate any other/existing bank accounts and it was observed



that there was a diversion of revenue to 19 new current accounts being operated in Canara Bank branches. Therefore, the respondent contends that the instant petition is again filed for the same relief which has been elaborately dealt with and rejected by this Court in the order dated 08.08.2012. Hence, he prayed to dismiss the petition.

4. Heard the submissions of Sri G.Ashok Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Srinivas Kapatia, learned Special Public Prosecutor for the respondent – CBI.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the relief sought is only a procedural modification, namely, permission to open and operate an additional account for carrying on legitimate business operations, while remaining fully compliant with all existing conditions relating to security, disclosure, and monitoring. He further submitted that the petitioner has never violated any conditions imposed by this Court in any manner. The said observation was made while disposing of the Criminal Petition on 01.11.2021. He further submitted that, in the changed circumstances, this Court has ample powers to modify the conditions imposed in its earlier



orders so as to adopt the same to the changed circumstances. He further submitted that the SBI has not acted upon and has expressed its inability to honour certain transactions through the petitioner's account and that if the State Bank of India does not carry out the said operation, then the petitioner would not be in a position to pay for the consignments received by them and that the said payment is essential, as they have imported the standard newsprint, and such imports form the backbone of their daily operations and if that is stalled the entire business comes to a halt, which would render all the employees of the company jobless. He further submitted that, to facilitate the smooth functioning of the petitioner company, which is engaged in the publication of a daily newspaper, the operation of a current account is essential and when the SBI has refused to operate the same and process payment, then the petitioner has no other option but for seeking redressal from this Court. He further submitted that unless the petitioner is permitted to open and operate a new current account, they may not be able to process the payments to the Russian companies from whom they have purchased the consignment and that the orders if any passed in this petition would not change the substantive



nature of the final orders passed in the Crl.P.No.4523 of 2012, and that it would be only a procedural modification. He further submitted that the substantive order of this Court granting permission to operate the bank accounts, subject to condition of depositing security, would remain unaltered, and that no prejudice would be caused to the respondent, as existing safeguards would continue. He therefore, prayed to allow the petition.

6. The learned Standing Counsel for the CBI submitted that the present application itself is not maintainable and that they cannot file an interlocutory application in an already disposed of criminal petition and that the prayer sought by the petitioner would amount to reviewing the final order passed in Crl.P.Nos.4523 of 2012 and batch. He further submitted that the order dated 01.11.2021 has attained finality, as the petitioner has not filed any SLP against these orders and once the orders have attained finality, they cannot seek to reopen the order or to make any modification in the said orders. Though the petitioner says that it is an interlocutory application the relief sought is substantive in nature and does not retain the



colour of interlocutory application. He further submitted that under the guise of interlocutory application, the petitioner is in fact seeking a substantive relief of opening and operating a new current account which is not permissible as per the reasoned orders passed by this Court earlier vide orders dated 06.07.2012 and 08.08.2012 respectively. He further argued that the order dated 06.07.2012 was interlocutory order in Crl.P.No.4523 of 2012 and batch, and that the petitions itself are disposed of vide common order dated 01.11.2021. Hence, the present petition seeking to modify the earlier order and asking for a prayer which was rejected in the earlier order dated 08.08.2012 in Crl.P.Nos.4523, 4524 and 4525 of 2012 cannot be sought again in a new interlocutory application, stating new circumstances. He therefore, prayed to dismiss the petition.

7. Perused the record.

8. The present petition is filed seeking to permit the petitioner to open and operate a new current account in any nationalized or scheduled commercial banks such as HDFC, Axis, ICICI and Bank of Baroda, subject to such conditions and



in the alternative the petitioner seeks a direction to the State Bank of India, Banjara Hills Branch to process and honour the petitioner's import-related and operational payments from the current account No.30252659825 in the name of the petitioner in the ordinary course.

9. The petitioner seeks the permission of this Court to open and operate a new account stating that the circumstances have changed ever since the final disposal of Crl.P.No.4523 of 2012. Hence, it is pertinent to briefly discuss about the facts of the case and the orders that were passed in Crl.P.No.4523 of 2012 by this Court.

10. Initially the applications vide Crl.M.P.Nos.1001, 1002 and 1004 of 2012 in C.C.No.8 of 2012 in RC No.19/2011(A)/2011 – CBI, Hyderabad filed before the CBI Court for de-freezing the accounts were dismissed vide orders dated 14.05.2012. Aggrieved by the same, Criminal Petition Nos.4523, 4524 and 4525 of 2012 filed by M/s.Jagati Publications Limited and its sister concerns i.e. M/s.Janani Infrastructure Limited and M/s.Indira Television seeking to set aside the order dated 14.05.2012 and consequently prayed to de-freeze the current



accounts. During the pendency of these applications, Crl.M.P.Nos.4520, 4521 and 4522 of 2012 were filed with a prayer to issue interim direction directing the respondent i.e. CBI to forthwith defreeze the current accounts of the petitioner company maintained in the State Bank of India, Banjara Hills branch. During the pendency of the criminal petition Nos.4523, 4524 and 4525 of 2012, the said IAs were disposed of vide orders dated 23.05.2012 wherein the current accounts of the petitioner were ordered to be defreezed subject to certain terms and conditions. The relevant operative portion of the order dated 23.05.2012 is as follows:

“10. Subject to the following terms and conditions, I am inclined to direct the respondent-CBI to defreeze the current accounts of the petitioners.

1. The petitioners shall not transfer or alienate in any form either by way of sale, mortgage, lease or otherwise dispose of any of its assets or create any third party interest or authorize any other person to deal with the assets by executing any GPA to deal with both movable and immovable properties i.e., all the assets shown in above paragraphs. Thus, the petitioners shall not effect any kind of transfer of all the fixed assets irrespective of the depreciation of the value of the properties.

2. Sri P. Kesava Rao, learned Standing Counsel for CBI submits that though an amount of Rs.94 crores is in fixed deposits, third party lien is there on that amount According to him, an amount of Rs.23 crores is lying in current accounts.

3. Only after furnishing bank guarantee as indicated below, the petitioners shall be allowed to operate the current accounts. As far as amount lying in fixed deposits is concerned, if the third party, which is having lien over the property, makes any claim, the same shall be intimated to the CBI and also to this Court. It is made clear that the Bank authorities shall not allow the petitioners to deal with these amounts in fixed deposits except to the extent of lien by third party.

4. Though the petitioners claim that total number of employees is at about 20,000, according to the learned Standing Counsel for CBI, the Commissioner of Labour vide Lr.No.P/5231/2012, dated 15.05.2012,



informed that only 4475 total employees have been working in M/s. Jagati Publications Limited and 540 employees in M/s. Indira Television Limited.

In the above circumstances, the petitioners are also directed to furnish the particulars of stringers and other employees, who are not covered by the employees furnished to the Commissioner of Labour, duly furnishing a copy to the CBI and the Commissioner of Labour. The Commissioner of Labour is also requested to make a detailed enquiry into the matter and furnish the particulars of other employees and stringers who are not covered by its above referred letter to enable this Court to pass appropriate orders. If the particulars of other employees are not furnished to the Commissioner of Labour as indicated above within four weeks from today, then the petitioners shall restrict the payments to those employees with regard to whom particulars have been furnished to the Commissioner of Labour from the month of July, 2012 onwards.

In the above circumstances, the petitioners are directed to see that all the revenue received through advertisements, circulations, scrap sales, printing charges etc., should be strictly deposited in the current accounts only and there should not be any diversion of any funds from any source to any other account. It appears that the total revenue to be incurred may be sufficient to meet the total expenditure every month, if properly utilized. The petitioners shall pay the salaries of all the employees through account payee cheques only. Similarly, the other expenditures i.e., consumption of newsprint, administrative and other overheads, also should be paid through the account payee cheques.

5. As far as agents are concerned, it is made clear that the petitioners shall not make any payments to the agents until further orders of this Court, since normally the agents themselves deduct the amount of their percentage and remit back the balance of sale proceeds of daily newspapers (circulation revenue).

6. The petitioners shall prepare a list of the cheques issued to the employees and for administrative and other over-heads, giving the particulars to whom the amounts have been paid along with their addresses and telephone numbers of those persons to the respondent CBI at least three days before issuing the cheques. If the CBI, on enquiry or on other information, entertains a doubt about the genuineness of the party in whose favour the cheques have been issued, may request the concerned Bank to stop the payment and the Bank shall temporarily accept such request and the CBI should immediately approach this Court and seek directions from this Court and the concerned Bank shall await at least for a period of one week before clearing those cheques after they receive oral or written instructions from the CBI.

7. The petitioners shall furnish the details of revenue and expenditure and the payments made by them, to this Court on or before 10th of every month duly furnishing a copy of all such particulars to the respondent-CBI.

11. Though Sri P. Kesava Rao, learned Standing Counsel for CBI, requested that the petitioners may be directed to give Bank guarantee for Rs.681.77 crores, since the total amount freezed is not more than Rs.9 crores in the current accounts and may not exceed Rs.25 crores in



all, I am of the view that the request of the learned Standing counsel for CBI cannot be accepted at this stage.

12. Sri C.Padmanabha Reddy, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners cannot give bank guarantee for Rs.94 crores with regard to which freezing order has been passed by CBI and that let the order issued by CBI freezing the said amount may continue and that the petitioners would give bank guarantee only with regard to the amount lying in the current accounts.

In the above circumstances, the petitioners are directed to furnish bank guarantee for the total sum that has been lying in the current accounts that have been frozen by the CBI, to the satisfaction of the Court below within two weeks from today.

As far as Rs.94 crores, which is lying in fixed deposits is concerned, the freezing order shall continue.

13. It is made clear that this order does not come in the way of CBI in taking any further steps to freeze the other accounts of the petitioners in any Bank or with regard to any other accounts or transactions, since it is alleged that the total crime money involved is Rs. 1172.56 crores."

11. It was specifically mentioned in the said orders as follows:

".....It is made clear that these orders are only interlocutory orders and parties are at liberty to approach this Court as and when they feel and slight modifications of these orders is necessary, if any practical difficulties arise".

12. Subsequently, another set of applications were filed vide Crl.M.P.Nos.4843, 4844 and 4845 of 2012 in Crl.M.P.No.4520, 4521 and 4522 of 2012 seeking modification of above said orders dated 23.05.2012 directing the respondents to defreeze the petitioner's current accounts without insisting on a bank guarantee for the said amount or in the alternative direct the respondent to defreeze the account by relaxing the condition of furnishing bank guarantee with regard to the quantum and also



extend the period for providing such bank guarantee by a further period of six weeks.

13. After going through the observations made in the orders dated 23.05.2012, this Court had disposed of the above said petitions vide orders dated 06.07.2012 as follows:

"In view of the above referred specific directions of this Court and with reference to the income received by the petitioners from different accounts, i.e., collection of revenue under various heads including from local advertisements and local recovery of sale price of newspapers and circulation news, the petitioner ought to have informed about the particulars of collection amount number and payment account number etc., to the CBI and also with regard to the transactions, if any, dealt by it. In view of the same, it is made clear that the petitioner shall not operate any other current account or any account for its day to day operations at any place in the name of any person or company contrary to the orders passed by this Court. In fact, the petitioners or the respondent should have brought to the notice of this Court about the collection accounts and payments accounts being operated by the petitioner at 19 locations. It is made clear that the condition imposed in this order as above and other conditions enumerated in the earlier order have to be strictly complied with. Thus, all the revenue receipts from various bank accounts, either by way of collection account, payment account or any other account, shall be operated strictly in compliance with the earlier orders dated 23.05.2012 passed by this Court. In view of the orders passed above, the 19 collections and payment accounts of the petitioners stands defreezed. This petition is ordered accordingly."

14. It is also borne out by record that another set of miscellaneous petitions were filed vide Crl.M.P.No.5543, 5587 and 5703 of 2012 in Crl.P.No.4523 of 2012 and Crl.M.P.No.5544 of 2012 in Crl.P.No.4524 of 2012 and Crl.M.P.No.5545 of 2012 in Crl.P.No.4525 of 2012 with a prayer to permit the petitioner to comply with the conditions imposed by this Court in Crl.M.P.No.4845 of 2011 in Crl.M.P.No.4520 of 2012 in Crl.P.No.4523 of 2012 by permitting



the petitioner to furnish immovable property as security by way of deposit of title deeds of properties belonging to M/s.Janani Infrastructure Ltd., and/or M/s.Jagati Publications Ltd., or in the alternative relax said condition of deposit of title deeds.

15. After an elaborate discussion over the facts and circumstances of the case and also discussing the earlier orders passed by this Court, the petitions were dismissed with exemplary costs of Rs.1,00,000/- for each petition payable to the Secretary, A.P.State Legal Services Authority, Hyderabad. While passing the said orders dated 08.08.2012, it was observed by this Court at Para No.13 as follows:

“13. In spite of the above, this Court passed an equitable order on 06.07.2012 making certain observations. Now, it is shocking to note that the petitioners have opened 19 accounts with Canara Bank and have been transacting with them. Sri S. Niranjana Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have to comply with the Audit Bureau Circulations (ABC) Guidelines. According to him, the ABC guidelines make it obligatory that the publisher members are required to deposit into the bank on the same day or the next working day cash received from all sources, viz., sale of copies, advertisement receipts and from any other source. Cash required by the publisher for day to day disbursement should be separately withdrawn and not adjusted from daily cash collection. Even if the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is true, nothing prevented the petitioners to approach this Court and seek permission to open 19 current accounts. The action of the petitioners in not informing the Court about the 19 current accounts being maintained with the State Bank of India even after passing orders on 23.05.2012 till those accounts are freezed by the CBI and subsequent opening of 19 current accounts with Canara Bank and transacting with the same after freezing the 19 current accounts with State Bank of India is nothing but a clear violation of the earlier orders passed by this Court on 23.05.2012 and on 06.07.2012 by this Court. **This Court, in its order dated 06.07.2012, categorically observed that the petitioner shall not operate any other current account or any account for its day to day operation at any place in the name of**



any person or company contrary to the orders passed by this Court.”

16. It was also observed by the Single Judge of this Court at Para No.15 as follows:

“...Thus, it is clear that the specific direction that there should be not be any diversion of collection of revenue is openly violated, since the revenues have been diverted to new 19 accounts being operated in Canara Bank branches. It appears that by opening new 19 current accounts in Canara Bank branches, the petitioners are conveniently hoodwinking and flouting the earlier orders of this Court. Therefore, they had no urgency to comply with the conditions imposed b y this Court in the earlier orders.”

17. It was also further observed by the Single Judge of this Court at Para No.16 as follows:

**“...there is no reason to modify the earlier order and moreover when it was observed that only when practical difficulties arise in implementing the order, the parties can approach the Court seeking slight modifications. In view of the conduct of the petitioner they are directed not to open any bank account in any bank without the prior permission of this Court and the CBI is directed to inform all the banks not to open any new bank accounts or to operate any other/existing bank accounts other than the bank accounts covered by the orders of this Court. In fact the CBI and any other investigating agency should promptly inform the court as and when the directions/orders of this Court are violated and flouted”.**

18. Subsequently, vide orders dated 01.11.2021 the Single Judge of this Court has finally disposed of the Criminal Petition Nos.4523, 4524 and 4525 of 2012 making the orders dated 23.05.2012 absolute and holding that it shall be in force till the final termination of the proceedings in the subject CC. The operative portion of the orders extracted hereunder:



“In view of the facts and circumstances of the cases, as the interest of the petitioners-companies, its employees etc., needs protection till the termination of the proceedings in C.C.No.8 of 2012 pending on the file learned Principal Special Judge for CBI Cases, Hyderabad, the common order, dated 23.05.2012, passed in CrI.M.P.Nos. 4520, 4521 and 4522 of 2012 in CrI.P.Nos.4523, 4524 and 4525 of 2012, is made absolute and it shall be in force till the final termination of the proceedings in the subject C.C.”

19. Subsequently, in the year 2025 another set of Criminal MPs have been filed vide I.A.No.01 of 2024 in CrI.M.P.Nos.4520 of 2012 in CrI.P.No.4523 of 2012 I.A.No.1 of 2024 in CrI.M.P.No.4521 of 2012 in CrI.P.No.4524 of 2012 and I.A.No.1 of 2024 in CrI.M.P.No.4522 of 2012 in CrI.P.No.4525 of 2012, seeking permission to substitute the title deeds of M/s.Revan Infra Pvt.Ltd., Bangalore vide document Nos.2179 of 2010, 2177 of 2010 and 2181 of 2010 dated 26.08.2010 deposited with the Principal Special Judge for CBI Cases, Nampally Hyderabad vide Memo dated 28.08.2012 by furnishing a bank guarantee or a fixed deposit for a sum of Rs.4,95,00,000/-, 23,42,000/- and 59,78,000/- subject to all other conditions enjoined upon the petitioner vide orders in CrI.P.Nos.4523, 4524 and 4525 of 2012. The said CrI.M.Ps. were disposed of vide common order dated 17.11.2025 by a coordinate Bench of this Court, wherein the petitioners were permitted to furnish the bank guarantee for half of the amount



lying in the current accounts of the petitioners at the time of freezing, from any nationalized bank to the satisfaction of the trial Court. Upon furnishing of said bank guarantees, the trial Court is directed to return the title deeds, which were deposited through memo dated 28.05.2012, to the petitioner after due verification and authorization. Thus, the condition is relaxed i.e. in place of title deeds, the petitioner was asked to submit bank guarantee while the remaining part of the order stood unaltered.

20. Now the present petition is filed seeking permission to open and operate a new current account. It is pertinent to take note of the fact that Crl.Petition Nos.4523, 4524 and 4525 of 2012 are finally disposed of and the said orders were not challenged by the petitioner herein, hence have attained finality. That being the case, the petitioner cannot seek any further substantive relief.

21. The petitioner counsel contends that it is not a substantive relief but it is a modification of interlocutory order and that the orders dated 06.07.2012 have prohibited the petitioner to open or operate any other account but for the



accounts permitted by this Court, which comes in the way of its business operations due to the change in circumstances. Hence, it is only a modification of the orders passed by this Court in the interlocutory application. Thus, his contention is that it does not amount to substantive modification or review of the final order and it is only modification of the interlocutory orders which is permissible.

22. It is pertinent to take note of the fact that it is not an interlocutory order that he is seeking in the present petition but it amounts to change in the final orders. The relief sought is entirely a new relief of seeking permission to open and operate new account. Further, it is pertinent to observe that, by the orders of this Court, there was a direction by this Court to the petitioner not to open any bank accounts in any bank and further the CBI was directed to inform all the banks not to open any new accounts or to operate any other/existing bank accounts and it was observed that there was a diversion of revenue to 19 new current accounts being operated in Canara Bank branches.



23. Thus, the said point was already addressed by this Court and it was emphasized that no new accounts were permitted to be opened or operated by the petitioner. It is only the interlocutory orders that were passed earlier on 23.05.2012 that were made absolute vide final orders dated 01.11.2021. If we take a look at the orders passed on 23.05.2012, certain conditions were imposed by this Court which have been subsequently modified vide orders dated 06.07.2012. Therefore, the petitioner has been approaching the Court in changed circumstances during the pendency of the criminal petition and the Court has passed orders accordingly. But in the present scenario, the petition has been disposed of finally and the nature of relief that is sought in the present petition does not amount to any modification in the interlocutory orders but it amounts to a substantive relief that is sought in the petition and a relief that has been already rejected by this Court.

24. The petitioner counsel contends that a coordinate Bench of this Court has disposed of the I.A.No.01 of 2024 in Crl.M.P.Nos.4520 of 2012 in Crl.P.No.4523 of 2012 I.A.No.1 of



2024 in CrI.M.P.No.4521 of 2012 in CrI.P.No.4524 of 2012 and I.A.No.1 of 2024 in CrI.M.P.No.4522 of 2012 in CrI.P.No.4525 of 2012, observing that the petitions are maintainable and that they do not amount to any alteration or review of the concluded order and that it is only a modification sought in the interlocutory order. It was observed by the learned Single Judge that, in the case on hand, the petitioner was seeking substitution of a bank guarantee/fixed deposit in place of title deeds, and it is only a procedural modification of an existing interlocutory arrangement and does not affect any substantive rights.

25. It was observed that the relief sought by the petitioner does not fall under Section 362 Cr.P.C. and there is no bar in according relief in the said application.

26. The contention of the petitioner counsel is that the present application is also similar to the I.A.No.1 of 2024 and that the coordinate Bench has rightly observed that it amounts only to modification of the orders in interlocutory application and that it does not amount to review of the final orders passed in the criminal petition. But there is a difference in the prayer



sought in I.A.No.1 of 2024 and the present petition. In I.A.No.01 of 2024 the petitioner sought for a relief of modifying the condition i.e. substitution of title deeds with bank guarantee but in the present case the petitioner seeks a permission to open and operate a new current account. The said point was already discussed at length and decided in the petition vide orders dated 06.07.2012 and also in the orders dated 08.08.2012. The interlocutory orders passed on 23.05.2012 has imposed several conditions to safeguard the interest of the petitioner as well as the respondents. Further, the orders dated 06.07.2012 clarified that the petitioner shall not operate any other current account or any account for its day to day operations at any place in the name of any person or company contrary to the orders passed by this Court. This Court, vide orders dated 08.08.2012 directed the petitioner not to open any bank account in any Bank without the prior permission of this Court, that does not mean to say that again they can file an interlocutory application in a disposed of matter seeking permission of this Court to open and operate a new account vide this interlocutory application.



27. The prayer sought in main criminal petition i.e. Crl.P.No.4523 of 2012 is to defreeze the accounts. The same was disposed of vide orders dated 01.11.2021 making the common order dated 23.05.2012 absolute and holding that it shall be in force till the final termination of the proceedings in the subject CC. The order dated 01.11.2021 disposing of the said petition attained finality as no appeal was preferred against the same. The relief now sought does not pertain to any modification of conditions imposed in the final orders but is an entirely new relief that is sought for. In case if they are aggrieved by the changed circumstances and in case if they want the said relief, they could have as well approached the trial Court for the said relief. But the present petition seeking a new direction in the already decided petition is not tenable in the eye of law. If it was really a modification of the interlocutory order that is already passed by this Court that could have been a different scenario as it would fall under the circumstances similar to those in I.A.No.1 of 2024 but in the present petition it is entirely a new relief that is sought by the petitioner i.e. to open and operate a new account. When the main criminal petition itself is disposed of on merits by this Court, granting



entirely a new relief in an interlocutory application, to the petitioner is not permissible in the eye of law. Therefore, the petition lacks merits and the same is liable to be dismissed.

28. In the result, the IA is dismissed. However, it does not preclude the petitioner to seek appropriate remedies according to law.

---

**JUSTICE TIRUMALA DEVI EADA**

Date: 08.04.2026  
ns