IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B.R.MADHUSUDHAN RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION No.14357 of 2026

CNR No.HBHC010598952026

DATED : 16.10.2026

BETWEEN:

Boodati Laxminarayana

.....Petitioner-Accused No.1

AND

The Directorate of Enforcement

...Respondent

ORDER

1. This Criminal Petition is filed under Sections 480 and 483 r/w Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) praying this Court to enlarge the petitioner on bail who is arrayed as accused No.1 in connection with in SC.No.888 of 2024 on the file of Metropolitan Sessions Judge-Cum-Special Court under the Provisions of Money Laundering Act, (PMLA), 2002, at Nampally, Hyderabad in ECIR/HYZO/42/2022 on the file of Directorate of Enforcement, Hyderabad.

2. Heard Sri Avinash Desai, learned Senior Counsel representing Ms.K.Ramya, learned counsel for the petitioner-A1 and Sri D.Narender Naik, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondent.

3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that there is procedural lapse in the investigation and pre-trial being delayed, supplemental complaint was not filed in SC.No.888 of 2024 nor any cognizance being taken in the above said SC. Supplemental complaint was filed in SC No.883 of 2025 but not in SC No.888 of 2024 as alleged by the respondent in the previous bail counters. There is non-compliance of the order in WP No.45620 of 2022 dated 29.12.2022 and no criminal case being made out even after 4 years of investigation. Prolonged incarceration being violation of Section 436A of the 1973 Code. Charge sheet is not filed in the predicate case and the petitioner was granted bail in Crime No.158 of 2022. SC.No.888 of 2024 is not in progress and the Sessions Case is being adjourned from time to time. Furthermore, the petitioner is not produced before the concerned Court for extension of remand. Earlier bail petitions came to be dismissed by this Court. In support of his contention has relied on the decisions in the cases of (1) Vijay Madanlal Choudhary and Ors. Vs. Union of India (UOI)

and Ors.[1] (2) Manish Sisodia Vs. Directorate of Enforcement[2] (3) V.Senthil Balaji Vs. The Deputy Director, Directorate of Enforcement[3] (4) Arvind Dham Vs. Directorate of Enforcement[4] (5) Pravez Khan Vs. Directorate of Enforcement[5] and prayed to enlarge the petitioner-A1 on bail.

4.1. Respondent has filed reply to the bail petition. It is stated in the reply that the respondent department has clearly made out a cogent case as to how the three foundation facts set out are *prima facie* established against the petitioner-A1. Petitioner-A1 has not complied with the twin conditions prescribed in Section 45 of the PMLA. The limitations so imposed are in addition to those imposed under Cr.P.C and has an overriding effect over the provisions of the Court in case there occurred any inconsistency between the provisions of the two. If the petitioner-A1 is enlarged on bail, there is reasonable apprehension that he may influence the witnesses, tamper the evidence and dispose of, alienate properties acquired using proceeds of crime. The proceeds of crime have been layered through numerous transactions. The alleged procedural lapses, delay in filing the supplementary complaint, pendency of

[1] (2023) 12 SCC 1
[2] (2024) 12 SCC 660
[3] AIR 2024 SC 4760
[4] 2026 INSC 12
[5] 2026:DHC:3773

predicate case, alleged non-compliance with judicial directions and delay in trial do not by themselves establish that the proceedings against the petitioner-A1 are unlawful or that the allegations are without substance. Petitioner-A1 cannot claim bail merely by selectively relying upon the procedural and personal circumstances while ignoring the material forming the basis of the prosecution. Petitioner-A1 has failed to demonstrate any legally sustainable ground warranting interference with the custody at this stage.

4.2. Learned Standing Counsel for the respondent submits that the son of the petitioner-A1 has filed anticipatory bail petition which came to be dismissed by this Court. Investigation is still pending to ascertain the details of other individuals/entities who have received the funds from the petitioner-A1. Petitioner's wife and son are still absconding. In support of his contention has relied on the decisions in the cases of (1) Y.S.Jagan Mohan Reddy Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation[6] (2) Gautam Kundu Vs. Majoj Kumar, Govt. of India[7] (3) Ajay Ajit Peter Kerkar Vs. Directorate of Enforcement and Anr.[8] (4) Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central bureau of

[6] MANU/SC/0487/2013
[7] MANU/SC/1453/2015
[8] Criminal Appeal Nos.2601-2602 of 2024 dated 16.05.2024 of the Supreme Court of India

Investigation and Ors.[9] (5) Tarun Kumar Vs. Assistant Director Directorate of Enforcement[10] and prayed to dismiss the petition.

5. Rejoinder is filed by the petitioner-A1 and contended that respondent has suppressed the material information in regard to refunds, payment made for taking permissions for the project and undertaking project works and contents of MOU agreements. In fact, on the basis of initiatives and work undertaken by the petitioner company, it is evident that the petitioner has bonafide intent of delivery of project and negate any kind of *mala fide* intent or *mens rea* on the part of the petitioner to cheat the home buyers. MOU are misconstrued since the agreement explicitly mentioned that the petitioner company is in progress of taking approvals and also agreed to allot proportionate land and as such, the respondent registration of complaint is misconceived and thus a civil complaint was coloured as a criminal case and in fact, the home buyers have pursued civil recourse before NCLT. Even otherwise, since the underlying transaction alleged was based on the MOU, the home buyers had civil remedies as per RERA and Civil Court and yet the respondent turned, Act of God event of COVID-19 and force Majeure as a criminal case against the petitioner. In fact, most of the FIRs are registered without

[9] MANU/SC/0851/2022
[10] 2023 INSC 1006

application of mind, since they are filed premature before the agreed timelines of delivery, as such, the entire investigation is prejudiced.

6.1. One M.Yashwanth Kumar has filed a complaint on 01.08.2022 alleging that the petitioner company had advertised "pre-launch offer" of building a world class residential gated community with an extent of 23 Acres at Ameenpur Village, Sangareddy District. The complainant and other customers of 240 members invested an amount of Rs.72,81,98,000/- in the company, and that the company did not get land acquisition and various permissions required from the authorities. Basing on the said complaint, case is registered before P.S. CCS, Hyderabad against the petitioner-accused in FIR No.158 of 2022 for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 r/w 34 of IPC, 1860 (predicate offence).

6.2. Petitioner has filed Crl.MP.No.307 of 2023 for grant of regular bail before the learned Sessions Judge in FIR No.158 of 2022 and he is enlarged on bail with conditions *vide* order dated 31.01.2023.

6.3. Section 420 of IPC is the schedule offence in FIR No.158 of 2022.

6.4. So far charge sheet is not filed in predicate offence as on date.

7. Customers of M/s Sahiti Infratech Ventures India (P) Ltd., (for short "SIVIPL") have filed Writ Petitions against the police for not registering the complaints against SIVIPL and its Directors. This Court *vide* common order in WP.No.45620 of 2022 and Batch has disposed of all the Writ Petitions on 29.12.2022 with an observation that the respondent - police concerned to register the complaints lodged by the petitioners in connection with SIVIPL and transfer the FIRs to Central Crime Station, Detective Department, Hyderabad for joint investigation in all the crimes and Investigating Officer, Central Crime Station, Detective Department, Hyderabad shall expedite and complete the investigation, as early as possible, preferably within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

8. Basing on FIR No.158 of 2022, Enforcement Case Information Record (ECIR) *vide* ECIR/HYZO/42/2022 was initiated on 11.09.2022 under Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (for short "PMLA") against the petitioners-A1 and two others. Petitioner – A1 was summoned under Section 50 of the PMLA on different dates.

9. Petitioner-A1 was arrested on 29.09.2024 in PMLA case at 2.35 P.M. and was produced before the concerned Court for remand, since then he is in jail. Respondent has filed complaint on 05.11.2024 and the learned Sessions Court has taken congnizance of the same and registered the case as SC.No.888 of 2024. Petitioner is shown as accused No.1, M/s Sahiti Infratech Ventures India Private Limited as A2 and M/s Sahiti Constructions is shown as A3. In the said complaint, the schedule of the property is shown as 10 Acres land situated at Sy.No.343 in Ameenpur Village, Patancheru Mandal, Medak District, Telangana and the registered documents are dated 12.08.2019, 23.09.2021 and 07.05.2020 and the value of the property is shown as Rs.89,63,64,000/-. Number of LWs. shown are LWs.1 to 26 and list of documents relied by the respondent are from document Nos.1 to 78. The prayer in the complaint is to take cognizance of offence against the accused for the offence of Money Laundering as defined under Section 3 r/w Section 70 of PMLA, 2002 punishable under Section 4 of PMLA, 2002.

10. Respondent has filed supplementary PC SC in SC No.888 of 2024 against S.Purnachandra Rao, Ex-Director of M/s.Sahiti Infratec Ventures India Private Limited-A4 and three others, the same is numbered as supplementary complaint in SC No.883 of

2025. The list of documents relied on by the respondent are from 79 to 193 and the list of witnesses are from LWs.27 to 38.

11. A4-Purnachandra Rao has filed regular bail petition before this Court *vide* Crl.P.No.4023 of 2026 and the same is allowed on 05.05.2026 with conditions.

12. Petitioner-A1 has filed Crl.P.No.2530 of 2025 before this Court for grant of regular bail, the same came to be dismissed *vide* order dated 16.04.2025 holding that the medical certificate produced by him is a forged and fabricated one, he possessed a mobile phone without obtaining any permission from the Court or the custodian.

13. Petitioner-A1 has filed another bail petition in Crl.P.No.7951 of 2026 before this Court, the same came to be dismissed *vide* order dated 16.06.2026 with an observation that the petitioner has to satisfy the twin conditions of Section 45 of the PMLA and there are number of victims who gave statements against the petitioner.

14. The present bail petition came to be filed on 31.08.2026 and immediately thereafter respondent has filed an application before the learned Sessions Court at Hyderabad in S.R.No.9034 of 2026 in SC.No.883 of 2025 under Section 50 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), 2002 seeking

permission to examine and record the statement of the petitioner-A1 who is presently in judicial custody.

15. Petitioner-A1 is in jail since 29.09.2024, the respondent having kept silent for all these days, immediately after filing the present bail application on 31.08.2026, moved an application before the learned Sessions Court seeking permission to record the statement of the petitioner-A1, when this Court heard the bail application on 05.10.2026 and posed a query to the Standing Counsel whether the statement of the petitioner-A1 is recorded under Section 50 of the PMLA, in turn the Standing Counsel submits that his statement will be recorded during the week end. It is to be noted here that respondent has obtained the order from the learned Sessions Court in SR.No.9034 of 2026 on 03.09.2026, they have not examined the petitioner-A1 till 05.10.2026 even after a period of one month.

16. Learned Standing Counsel for the respondent during the course of arguments, on instructions submits that the respondent needs 4 to 5 months to complete the entire investigation in the case.

17. It is appropriate to refer Section 45 of the PMLA which reads as under:

"45. Offences to be cognizable and non-bailable.

1. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), no person accused of an offence under this Act shall be released on bail or on his own bond unless

(i) the Public Prosecutor has been given an opportunity to oppose the application for such release; and

(ii) where the Public Prosecutor opposes the application, the Court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that he is not guilty of such offence and that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail:

Provided that a person, who is under the age of sixteen years or is a woman or is sick or infirm [or is accused either on his own or along with other co-accused of money-laundering a sum of less than one crore rupees] may be released on bail, if the Special Court so directs:

Provided further that the Special Court shall not take cognizance of any offence punishable under section 4 except upon a complaint in writing made by

(i) the Director; or

(ii) any officer of the Central Government or State Government authorised in writing in this behalf by the Central Government by a general or a special order made in this behalf by that Government.

(1-A) Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), or any other provision of this Act, no police officer shall investigate into an offence under this Act unless specifically authorised, by the Central Government by a general or special order, and, subject to such conditions as may be prescribed;

(2) The limitation on granting of bail specified in [***] sub-section (1) is in addition to the limitations under the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) or any other law for the time being in force on granting of bail.

18. The punishment under Section 4 of the PMLA, 2002 is punishable with Rigorous Imprisonment for a term which shall

not be less than 3 years, which may extend to 7 years and shall also be liable to fine.

19.1. Standing Counsel has filed copy of impounding order issued under Section 50(5) of the PMLA dated 17.10.2024 wherein it is stated that during the course of investigation under PMLA in the instant ECIR, they have impounded Realme Narzo 30 with SIM card Mobile No.+91-8317655305 (JIO) having model No.RMX2156 and Serial No.ZPT4KN4DSCGELRIF from the petitioner-A1.

19.2. Standing Counsel submits that the petitioner-A1 is an influential person, if he is enlarged on bail, he may tamper with the evidence. It is to be noted here that in so far as the impounding of the cell phone is concerned, this Court has also referred the same in Crl.P.No.2530 of 2025 at Para No.5.2 which reads as under:

> "5.2. He also submitted that on 14.10.2022, the Investigating Officers issued summons for recording the statement of the petitioner under Section 50(2) and (3) of the PMLA and on 31.10.2022, 01.11.2022 and 02.11.2022, during the course of recording the statement of the petitioner, undertook to submit information and documents as sought by the Investigating Officer. The petitioner is a very influential person. When the petitioner was in E.D. custody on 17.10.2024, the petitioner was found in illegal possession of one mobile phone, without obtaining any permission from the Court or the custodian. Accordingly,

the mobile phone possessed by the petitioner was impounded under Section 50(5) of the PMLA, through the Impounding Order dated 17.10.2024. However, instead of appearing before the Investigating Officer to submit requisite information, the petitioner submitted a fake medical certificate on 18.11.2022. The Investigating Officers have given number of opportunities through summons dated 05.04.2023, 12.05.2023, 26.05.2023, 17.08.2023 and 10.09.2024, but he remained evasive and failed to appear before the Investigating Officer and not produced the requisite information. When the respondent/Investigating Officers enquired about the medical certificate produced by the petitioner through the concerned Medical Officer, who categorically denied and stated that he has not treated the petitioner and not issued the medical certificate, which was produced by the petitioner, and the said medical certificate was forged and fabricated one and the petitioner is absconding".

20. During the course of hearing the bail petition, Standing Counsel for the respondent has furnished a sealed cover and contended that it contains the progress of the investigation. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner-A1 has strongly opposed furnishing the sealed covers to the Court and that the petitioner-A1 must know what it contains.

21.1. In Vijay Madanlal Choudhary[1], Supreme Court observed at Para No.302 which reads as under:

"302 .... The twin conditions provided under S.45, though restrict the right of the accused to grant of bail, <u>but it cannot be said that the conditions provided under S.45 impose absolute</u>

restrain on the grant of bail. The discretion vests in the Court which is not arbitrary or irrational but judicial, guided by the principles of law as provided under S.45."

21.2. In **Manish Sisodia**[2], Supreme Court observed at Para 47, 48 and 53 as under:

"47. That, on account of a long period of incarceration running for around 17 months and the trial even not having been commenced, the appellant has been deprived of his right to speedy trial.

48. As observed by this Court, the right to speedy trial and the right to liberty are sacrosanct rights. On denial of these rights, the trial Court as well as the High Court ought to have given due weightage to this factor.

53. In the present case, in ED matter as well as CBI matter, 493 witnesses have been named. The case involves thousands of pages of documents and over a lakh pages of digitised documents. It is thus clear that there is not even the remotest possibility of the trial being concluded in the near future. In our view, keeping the appellant behind bars for an unlimited period of time in the hope of speedy completion of trial would deprive his fundamental right to liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution. As observed time and again, the prolonged incarceration before being pronounced guilty of an offence should not be permitted to become punishment without trial".

21.3. In **V.Senthil Balaji**[3], the Supreme Court observed at para Nos.21 and 29 as under :

"21. Hence, the existence of a scheduled offence is *sine qua non* for alleging the existence of proceeds of crime. A property derived or obtained, directly or indirectly, by a person as a result of the criminal activity relating to a scheduled offence constitutes proceeds of crime. The existence of proceeds of crime at the time of the trial of the offence under Section 3 of PMLA can be proved only if the scheduled offence is established in the prosecution of the

scheduled offence. Therefore, even if the trial of the case under the PMLA proceeds, it cannot be finally decided unless the trial of scheduled offences concludes. In the facts of the case, there is no possibility of the trial of the scheduled offences commencing in the near future. Therefore, we see no possibility of both trials concluding within a few years.

29. As stated earlier, the appellant has been incarcerated for 15 months or more for the offence punishable under the PMLA. In the facts of the case, the trial of the scheduled offences and, consequently, the PMLA offence is not likely to be completed in three to four years or even more. If the appellant's detention is continued, it will amount to an infringement of his fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution of India of speedy trial".

21.4. In **Arvind Dham**[4], the Supreme Court observed at para No.18 which reads as under:

"18. The right to speedy trial, enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution, is not eclipsed by the nature of the offence. Prolonged incarceration of an undertrial, without commencement or reasonable progress of trial, cannot be countenanced, as it has the effect of converting pretrial detention into form of punishment. Economic offences, by their very nature, may differ in degree and fact, and therefore cannot be treated as homogeneous class warranting a blanket denial of bail".

21.5. In **Pravez Khan**[5], High Court of Delhi observed at para No.6.7 as under:

"6.7. But for the predicate offence, the accused/applicants have already been granted bail. One wonders, if duty of the ED was simply to follow the money trail, that too majorly on the basis of statements under Section 50 PMLA, without caring to at least prima facie establish connection between the allegedly tainted money and the alleged predicate offence. And if that was so, keeping in mind the quantum of money allegedly earned by each of the accused/applicants, one also would wonder, whether they

deserve to be left in jail to rot in perpetuity. What if ultimately, in the predicate offence the accused/applicants are acquitted".

22.1. In **Y.S.Jagan Mohan Reddy**[6], the Supreme Court observed at Para No.17 which reads as under:

"17. Taking note of all these facts and the huge magnitude of the case and also the request of the CBI asking for further time for completion of the investigation in filing the charge sheet(s), without expressing any opinion on the merits, we are of the opinion that the release of the Appellant at this stage may hamper the investigation. However, we direct the CBI to complete the investigation and file the charge sheet(s) within a period of 4 months from today. Thereafter, as observed in the earlier order dated 05.10.2012, the Appellant is free to renew his prayer for bail before the trial Court and if any such petition is filed, the trial Court is free to consider the prayer for bail independently on its own merits without being influenced by dismissal of the present appeal".

22.2. In **Gautam Kundu**[7], the Supreme Court observed at Para No.30 which reads as under:

"30. .....PMLA has an overriding effect and the provisions of Code of Criminal Procedure would apply only if they are not inconstant with the provisions of the Act. Therefore, the conditions enumerated in Section 45 of PMLA will have to be complied with even in respect of an application for bail made under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure that coupled with the provisions of Section 24 provides that unless the contrary is proved, the Authority or the Court shall presume that proceeds of crime are involved in money laundering and the burden to prove that the proceeds of crime are not involved, lies on the Appellant".

22.3. In **Ajay Ajit Peter Kerkar**[8], the Supreme Court observed at Para No.5 which reads as under:

> "5. In the facts of the case, we find that there is no prospect of even the trial commencing, as the charge has find that the not been framed. In these facts, appellant will be entitled to be enlarged on bail under section 436A of the CRPC on 27th May, 2024. Hence, there is no need to have multiplicity of proceedings".

22.4. In **Satender Kumar Antil**[9], the Supreme Court observed at Para No.64 which reads as under:

> "64. Now we shall come to category (C). We do not wish to deal with individual enactments as each special Act has got an objective behind it, followed by the rigor imposed. The general principle governing delay would apply to these categories also. To make it clear, the provision contained in Section 436A of the Code would apply to the Special Acts also in the absence of any specific provision. For example, the rigor as provided Under Section 37 of the NDPS Act would not come in the way in such a case as we are dealing with the liberty of a person. We do feel that more the rigor, the quicker the adjudication ought to be. After all, in these types of cases number of witnesses would be very less and there may not be any justification for prolonging the trial. Perhaps there is a need to comply with the directions of this Court to expedite the process and also a stricter compliance of Section 309 of the Code".

22.5. In **Tarun Kumar**[10], the Supreme Court observed at Para No.17 which reads as under:

> "17. As well settled by now, the conditions specified under Section 45 are mandatory. They need to be complied with. The Court is required to be satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of such offence and he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. It is needless to say that as per the statutory presumption permitted under Section 24 of the Act, the Court or the Authority is entitled to

> presume unless the contrary is proved, that in any proceedings relating to proceeds of crime under the Act, in the case of a person charged with the offence of money laundering under Section 3, such proceeds of crime are involved in money laundering. Such conditions enumerated in Section 45 of PML Act will have to be complied with even in respect of an application for bail made under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in view of the overriding effect given to the PML Act over the other law for the time being in force, under Section 71 of the PML Act.

23. The last bail application filed by the petitioner-A1 came to be dismissed on 16.06.2026 in Crl.P.No.7951 of 2026. The changed circumstances in the investigation process after the dismissal of the earlier bail application of the petitioner-A1 is that the respondent has further examined 26 witnesses from 16.06.2026 till the date of hearing the bail petition and furthermore, the statement of the petitioner-A1 under Section 50 of the PMLA might have been recorded by the respondent.

24. This Court in a batch of Writ Petition Nos.45620 has directed the Investigating Officer, Central Crime Station, Detective Department, Hyderabad to expedite and complete the investigation as early as possible within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of the copy of the order. The order passed by this Court in the above said Writ Petitions is on 29.12.2022. At the cost of repetition, no charge sheet is filed in the predicate offence as on date, 4 years is lapsed. Respondent filed the first prosecution complaint on 05.11.2024 against the

petitioner-A1, A2 and A3 and supplementary complaint came to be filed on 23.10.2025 against S.Purnachandra Rao and three others which came to be numbered as SC.No.883 of 2025.

25. Petitioner-A1 was taken police custody from 14.10.2024 to 18.10.2024.

26. It is apt to note here that in Criminal Miscellaneous Petition No.307 of 2023 in Crime No.158 of 2022 of P.S. CCS. DD. Hyderabad (predicate offence), the learned Sessions Judge observed that "the petitioner is in remand since 01.12.2022. But admittedly, prosecution has not sought for extension of time period for investigation and no charge sheet is filed even after lapse of statutory period of 60 days of remand of the petitioner, as such, the petitioner-A1 is entitled for bail when the investigating officer has not filed the charge sheet within the stipulated period.

27. Petitioner-A1 is in judicial custody since 29.09.2024, still hearing on charges is not commenced and the Sessions Case has been adjourned from time to time. On some occasions, the remand of the petitioner-A1 is extended without his production from the jail. This Court is of the view that there is no possibility of commencement of trial in near future in view of the fact that charges are not yet framed in the SC No.888 of

2024 and furthermore, no charge sheet is filed in the predicate offence. Even if the trial in SC No.888 of 2024 is proceeded, it cannot be finally decided unless the trial in the schedule offence concludes. Petitioner-A1 cannot be vicariously penalised for the acts or omissions of the absconding accused, which cannot be a genuine factor to deny bail who is otherwise entitled to. The punishment under Section 4 of the PMLA is up to 7 years. The petitioner-A1 is in prison since more than two years. The case involves with numerous documents and there is no remotest possibility of the trial being concluded in the near future. Keeping the petitioner-A1 behind bars for an unlimited period of time in the hope of speedy completion of investigation/trial would deprive his fundamental right to liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution. Prolonged incarceration before being pronounced guilty of an offence should not be permitted to become punishment without trial. The apprehension of the Standing Counsel for the respondent is that if the petitioner-A1 is enlarged on bail, there is possibility of influencing the witnesses, the same can be taken care of by imposing stringent conditions on the petitioner-A1. Petitioner-A1 has made out a case for grant of bail with conditions.

28. In the result, petition is allowed subject to the following conditions:

i. The petitioner-A1 shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs only), with two Local sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned Metropolitan Sessions Judge Cum Special Court under the Provision of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), 2002, at Nampally.

ii. The petitioner-A1 shall surrender his pass-port before the learned Metropolitan Sessions Judge Cum Special Court under the Provision of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), 2002, at Nampally.

iii. The petitioner-A1 shall not leave the country without the leave of the learned Metropolitan Sessions Judge Cum Special Court under the Provision of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), 2002, at Nampally.

iv. The petitioner-A1 shall appear before the respondent on every Wednesday for a period of four months and co-operate with the investigating agency.

v. The petitioner-A1 shall not directly or indirectly influence, threaten, or induce any of the prosecution witnesses.

vi. In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, the prosecution is at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail.

_____

B.R.MADHUSUDHAN RAO, J

Date: 16.10.2026
PLV

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B.R.MADHUSUDHAN RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION No.14357 of 2026

CNR No.HBHC010598952026

DATED : 16.10.2026

PLV