APHC010450922026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3521]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE 18th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NOs: 7600 and 8063 of 2026

1.CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 7600/2026

Between:

1. ANALA SWETHA, W/O.ANGAJALA SANTOSH,AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS, OCC DEPUTY BRANCH MANAGAR,STATE BANK OF INDIA, MAHABOOB NAGAR, TELANGANA,R/O. RRR ARCADE APARTMENT, THIRD FLOOR, OPP II TOWNPOLICE STATION, VIZAYANAGARAM DISTRICT.
2. ANGAJALA HARINI, W/O.A.GOWRI SHANKAR,AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS, OCC BUSINESS,R/O. RRR ARCADE APARTMENT, THIRD FLOOR,OPP II TOWN POLICE STATION, VIZIYANAGARAM.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP., BY ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTORHIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATHI.
2. PACHIPENTA SATYA GOWRI, W/O. MADHUSUDHANA RAO, AGE. 45 YEARS, R/O. DOOR NO.LIG-B-395, SAGAR NAGAR, ARILOVA MANDAL, VISAKHAPATNAM COMMISSIONERATE. RESPONDENT NO.2 IS IMPLEADED AS PER THE COURT ORDER DATED 08.09.2026 IN CRL.P.NO.7600 OF 2026.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused(S):

P V N KIRAN KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant(S):

1. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
2. P MOHAN RAO
3. LEGAL AID

2.CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 8063/2026

Between:

1. BEHARA MADHURI, W/O KIRAN KUMAR,AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS,R/O 511-A, SECTOR-6, UKKUNAGARAM,PEDAGANTYADA, VISAKHAPATNAM-530032.
2. BATTULA YUVA NAGA BRAHMARAMBIKA, ,W/O HARSHA VEMULA,AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS.RESIDENT OF DOOR NO.46-10-36,CHINNA GANDHI BOMMA STREET,DANAVAI PETA, RAJAHMUNDRY URBAN,EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT-533101.
3. VISHNU VIJAYAN, S/O M.G.VIJAYAN,AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS.RESIDENT OF DOOR NO.7-1-81,FEROZGUDA, NEAR AYYAPPA TEMPLE,BALANAGAR, HYDERABAD-500011,TELANGANA STATE.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)

AND

THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, ,REPRESENTED BY ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI.(ARILOVA POLICE STATION)

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused(S):

T V SRI DEVI

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant:

PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following:

COMMON ORDER:

These two Criminal Petitions are heard and disposed of by way of this common order, as they arise out of the same crime, but the petitioners are different.

2. These two Criminal Petitions have been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity, 'the BNSS'), by the petitioners/Accused Nos.2 to 6, seeking to grant pre-arrest bail in connection with Crime No.78 of 2025 of Arilova Police Station, Visakhapatnam District, registered for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 316(2), 351(2) read with 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhitha, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNS'), Section 21(1)(2)(3) of the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019 and Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Prize Chits & Money Circulation Schemes (Banning) Act, 1978 (for brevity 'the PC & MCSB Act').

3. Mr.P.V.N.Kiran Kumar and Ms.T.V.Sridevi, learned counsel for the petitioners, submit that the petitioners are innocent of the alleged offences. They are law-abiding citizens and have not committed any offence. They are the sole breadwinners of their respective families and have been falsely implicated by the police. The petitioners undertake to strictly adhere to any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. In light of the foregoing submissions, the learned counsel pray that the present petitions be allowed in the interest of justice.

4. *Per contra*, Mr. A. Sai Rohith, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, and Sri P.Mohan Rao, learned Legal Aid Counsel for respondent No.2, vehemently oppose the grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners, submitting that the investigation is still underway and several material witnesses remain to be examined. It is contended that, if the petitioners are granted pre-arrest bail, there is a strong likelihood of their absconding, thereby hampering the ongoing investigation and evading the process of law. Hence, it is urged that the petitions be dismissed.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor and the learned Legal Aid Counsel for respondent No.2. Perused the record.

6. This Court, by order dated 22.09.2026, passed the following order:

> *Notice on Respondent No.2 is sent, but it was refused.*
> *Mr.P.Mohan Rao, learned counsel, is appointed as Legal Aid Counsel for Respondent No.2.*
> *The Secretary, High Court Legal Services Committee, is directed to issue the necessary proceedings in this regard.*
> *Heard learned counsel for the Petitioners and learned Assistant Public Prosecutor.*
> *The grievance of Respondent No.2 is that the Petitioners, along with certain others, induced him to invest huge amounts in Vihaan Direct Selling India Private Limited (QNET). Respondent No.2 alleges that a total sum of Rs.48,23,840/- was invested by him on the inducement of the Petitioners and other accused, resulting in financial loss.*
> *Petitioner No.1/Accused No.2 is a Deputy Branch Manager of State Bank of India.*
> *Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, and considering the gravity and nature of the allegations leveled against the Petitioners, the Investigating Officer is directed not to arrest the Petitioners until the next date of hearing.*
> *The Petitioners shall appear before the Investigating Officer on 29.09.2026 and continue to appear as and when directed, until further orders.*

> *The Investigating Officer shall conduct the further investigation in accordance with law, and the Petitioners shall cooperate with the investigation.*
> *For hearing of the learned legal aid Counsel for Respondent No.2, post on 13.10.2026.*

7. The learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the petitioners have promptly complied with the directions issued by this Court and have been cooperating with the Investigating Officer.

8. Petitioner No.1/Accused No.2 in Crl.P.No.7600 of 2026 is working as Deputy Branch Manager of SBI. Accused No.2 is the sister of Accused No.3. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the amounts allegedly collected by the petitioners from the gullible public/depositors were duly credited to the account of Accused No.1 and, thus, the ultimate beneficiary is Accused No.1. The petitioners have collected money from the de-facto complainant and other victims for the purpose of investment in the company of Accused No.1, namely, Vihaan Direct Selling India Private Limited (QNET).

9. The learned counsel for the petitioners relied upon the order dated 05.05.2026 passed by the High Court of Telangana in Crl.P.No.7394 of 2024, filed under Section 528 of ‘the BNSS’, wherein the following order was passed:

> *Notice before admission.*
> *Learned Additional Public Prosecutor takes notice on behalf of respondent No.1.*
> *Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to take out personal notice to respondent No.2 by way of speed post with acknowledgment due and file proof of service.*

> *Mr. R.N.Hemendranath Reddy, learned Senior Counsel, representing Mr.T.V.Ramana Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner is accused in Crime No.52 of 2026 of Central Crime Station (CCS), Hyderabad, and he approached this Court and filed Crl.P.No.5712 of 2026 seeking to quash the proceedings in Crime No.52 of 2026, and the said case was adjourned at the instance of learned Additional Public Prosecutor, to 06.07.2026 and in the meantime directed the Investigating Officer not to take any coercive steps against the petitioner therein. In the present case also, the very same allegations are levelled against the petitioner/accused No.1 and requested this Court to hear this criminal petition along with Crl.P.No.5712 of 2026 and to extend the very same benefit to the petitioner herein.*
>
> *Learned Public Prosecutor submits that the Investigating Officer will not take any coercive steps against the petitioner/accused No.1. However, the petitioner/accused No.1 may be directed to cooperate with the investigation and to furnish the address particulars, cell number, e-mail and other particulars to the Investigating Officer.*
>
> *Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner/accused No.1 will furnish the said particulars to the Investigating Officer within one week.*
>
> *Recording the above said submissions made by the respective parties, post on 06.07.2026 along with Crl.P.No.5712 of 2026.*

10. The petitioners have fixed abodes. With regard to the allegations against Accused Nos.4 to 6, it is alleged that they joined Zoom meetings and induced the de-facto complainant and other victims to invest money in the company of Accused No.1. Though the amounts were deposited in the accounts of some of the petitioners/accused herein, it is firmly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners that those amounts were specifically transferred to the account of Accused No.1. The learned Assistant Public Prosecutor submits that the petitioners enjoyed several foreign trips out of the amounts deposited by the de-facto complainant and other victims in the company of Accused No.1.

11. Having regard to the entire facts and circumstances of the case, and considering the gravity and nature of the allegations levelled against the

petitioners/Accused Nos.2 to 6, this Court deems it appropriate to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioners/Accused Nos.2 to 6, subject to certain stringent conditions.

12. In the result, these two Criminal Petitions are allowed with the following conditions:

i. In the event of their arrest, the petitioners/Accused Nos.2 to 6 shall be enlarged on bail subject to their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/-(Rupees Fifty Thousand only) each with two sureties for the like sum each to the satisfaction of the arresting police officials;

ii. The petitioners/Accused Nos.2 to 6 shall not cause any threat, inducement or promise to the prosecution witnesses

iii. The petitioners/Accused Nos.2 to 6 shall appear before the Investigating Officer concerned as and when required and cooperate with the Investigating Officer till completion of the investigation.

iv. The petitioners/Accused Nos.2 to 6 shall not leave the limits of the State of Andhra Pradesh without the express permission from the Investigating Officer concerned.

v. The petitioners/Accused Nos.2 to 6 shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court.

_____

DR. Y. LAKSHMANA RAO, J

Date: 18.11.2026
RSI

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NOs: 8063 and 7600 of 2026

Date: 18.11.2026
RSI