

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.14088 of 2025

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner-accused No.5 in Crime No.1187 of 2024 before the Panjagutta Police Station, Hyderabad, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 408, 420, 467, 468 read with 120-B of IPC.

2. The brief facts of the case are that, on 21.11.2024, the *de-facto* complainant lodged a report before the police stating that Nalam Anjani Kumar, Piratla Lakshmi Mangatayaru, Ponasanapalli Padmavathi Devi, Kottu Suresh, Garre Sriramakrishnananda swamy and others were involved in cheating, criminal misappropriation, criminal breach of trust, forgery of valuable security, and using forged documents as genuine, thereby causing wrongful loss to the tune of Rs.57,67,164/-. The complainant, who is the Finance Controller of Yashoda Group of Hospitals (YGH), stated that YGH is engaged in providing healthcare services and operates four hospital units in Hyderabad, located at Malakpet,

Secunderabad, Somajiguda, and Hi-tech City. Nalam Anjani Kumar was appointed as Manager (Accounts) on 10.02.2016 at YGH. He was responsible for handling the accounts payable (both GRN and Non-GRN) divisions from the Corporate Office at Nagarjuna Hills and the Hi-tech City unit. In the course of his duties, he was entrusted with dominion over the funds in various bank accounts of YGH, for the purpose of ensuring payments to suppliers/vendors were credited to their respective accounts by issuing necessary instructions to the concerned YGH banks. However, he misappropriated these funds and transferred a portion of the amount to the petitioner-accused No.5. As such, the complainant requested necessary action. Based on the said complaint, the police registered a case for the alleged offences.

3. Heard Sri Narendar Jalli, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Sri Arun Kumar Doddla, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State.

4. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that none of the alleged offences were applicable to the petitioner. Merely because some amount had been transferred by Accused No.1 to the account of the petitioner, it did not

establish any connection of the petitioner with the alleged offences, and he was innocent of the said allegations. Accused No.1 happened to be the schoolmate of the petitioner, and whenever financial assistance was required, the petitioner had availed the services of Accused No.1 and repaid the said amount upon completion. Accused No.1 was a Chartered Accountant, and the *de-facto* complainant had also utilized his services. He further submitted that the allegations were fabricated and had been falsely attributed to him merely because he had availed financial assistance from Accused No.1 as and when required for business purposes. Therefore, the custodial interrogation was not necessary, as there were no specific averments constituting the alleged offences against the petitioner. Hence, requested the Court to grant pre-arrest bail by allowing the criminal petition.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner stating that a substantial financial loss of Rs.57,67,164/- was involved in the case and that the investigating authority needed to recover the same from the accused. He further contended that granting anticipatory bail

to the petitioner at this stage would obstruct the investigation, and hence, the Court was urged to dismiss the criminal petition.

6. Upon considering the submissions made by both the learned counsel and examining the material available on record, it appeared that the allegations were primarily against Accused No.1. The only allegation against the petitioner was that certain amounts had been transferred to his account. On one occasion, amounts of Rs.1,24,383/-, Rs.3,51,047/-, and Rs.7,10,187/-, totaling Rs.11,85,617/-, had been transferred. However, there were no direct averments connecting the petitioner with the offence punishable under Section 467 of IPC. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and the overall facts and circumstances, this Court deemed it appropriate to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner-Accused No.5, subject to the following conditions:

- i. The petitioner-accused No.5 shall surrender before the Station House Officer, Panjagutta Police Station, Hyderabad, within two weeks from today, and on such surrender, the said Station House Officer shall release him on bail on executing a personal bond for Rs.25,000/- with two sureties, for the like sum each.

- ii. The petitioner-accused No.5 shall abide by the other conditions stipulated in Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and co-operate with the Investigating Officer in investigating the case.
- iii. The petitioner-accused No.5 shall appear before the concerned Investigating Officer on every Monday between 09:00 a.m, and 05:00 p.m., till the filing of the charge sheet and thereafter, as and when required.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

K. SUJANA, J

Date: 13.11.2025
SS

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE K. SUJANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.14088 of 2025

Date: 13.11.2025

SS