


Reserved on : 19.08.2025
Pronounced on : 01.09.2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 01ST DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. NAGAPRASANNA

WRIT PETITION No.17876 OF 2025 (GM - RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI G.SATYANARAYANA VARMA
S/O G.VENKAT RAJU
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
R/AT FLAT NO.G2
S.R.AVENUE, BRINDAVAN COLONY
HYDER NAGAR, KUKATPALLY
HYDERABAD – 500 072.
(PRESENTLY IN JUDICIAL CUSTODY)

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI RAJESH MAHALE, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI ASHWIN KUMAR H., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1 . STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY CID/HIGH GROUNDS POLICE
BY SPECIAL INVESTIGATION TEAM
REPRESENTED BY SPP
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
BENGALURU – 560 001.

2. CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT OF PRISON
CENTRAL PRISON
PARAPPANA AGRAHARA
ELECTRONIC CITY
BENGALURU – 560 100.
3. KARNATAKA MAHARSHI VALMIKI
PARISHISTA PANGADAGALA ABHIVRUDDI NIGAMA
REPRESENTED BY GENERAL MANAGER.

AMENDED VIDE COURT ORDER DATED 20.06.2025.

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI B.N.JAGADEESHA, ADDL. SPP FOR R1 AND R2;
SRI VIKRAM HUILGOL, SENIOR ADVOCATE A/W.,
SRI SHISHIRA AMARNATH, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ENTIRE CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS IN CRIME NO. 118/2024 PENDING ON THE FILE OF THE XXIII ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE AND SPECIAL JUDGE (P.C. ACT), BENGALURU (ANNEXURE-C) ARISING OUT OF FIR IN CRIME NO. 118/2024 DATED 28.05.2024 (ANNEXURE-A) AND THE CHARGE SHEET DATED 05.08.2024 (ANNEXURE-E) FILED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 POLICE FOR THE ALLEGED OFFENCE PUNISHABLE U/S 120B, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 OF THE IPC AND SECTION 13(1), R/W 13(2) OF THE PC ACT, 1988 AS AGAINST THE PETITIONER IS CONCERNED.

THIS WRIT PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR ORDERS ON 19.08.2025, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:-

CORAM: **THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.NAGAPRASANNA**

CAV ORDER

The petitioner is before this Court invoking its inherent jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code (528 of BNSS), seeking quashment of the entire criminal proceedings in Crime No.118 of 2024 pending before the XXIII Additional City Civil & Sessions Judge and Special Judge (P.C.Act), Bengaluru and consequent filing of the charge sheet for offences punishable under Sections 120B, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 of the IPC and Section 13(1) r/w 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

2. Facts, in brief, germane are as follows: -

2.1. The 3rd respondent/Karnataka Maharshi Valmiki Parishista Pangadagala Abhivruddi Nigama represented by its General Manager is the complainant. The petitioner is accused No.1 in the charge sheet so filed in Crime No.118 of 2024. The brief history to the arraigning of the petitioner as accused No.1 is germane to be noticed. On 19-02-2024, an account comes to be

opened in Union Bank of India, M.G. Road Branch ('the Bank' for short) in the name of Karnataka Maharshi Valmiki Parishishta Scheduled Tribes Development Corporation Limited ('the Corporation' for short). Immediately after opening of the account, on various dates from 04-03-2024 to 21-05-2024 amount totaling to ₹187.33 crores is deposited and transferred into the account of the Corporation by 5 transactions in total i.e., ₹25/- crores on 4-03-2024; ₹25/- crores on 6-03-2024; ₹44/- crores on 21-03-2024; ₹33/- crores on 22-03-2024; ₹50/- crores on 21-05-2024. Between 5-03-2024 and 6-05-2024, 18 transfers are made to various accounts held by business entities totaling to ₹94,73,08,500/-.

2.2. On 23-05-2024, the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation questions the officers of the Bank about transfers. On questioning, the transfer of ₹5/- crores was immediately restored into the account of the Corporation. Noticing some serious foul play, a complaint comes to be registered by the Corporation before the High Grounds Police Station alleging gross irregularities and misappropriation *inter alia*, by the employees of the Bank. On 28-05-2024, the complaint becomes a crime in Crime No.118 of

2024 against 6 officials of the Bank. Several persons who were not named in the crime were taken into custody on 31-05-2024. On 11-06-2024, the Investigating Officer noticing the fact that certain amounts have emanated or dropped into the account of the petitioner, approached the house of the petitioner at 11.30 p.m. at Hyderabad and takes him into custody by undertaking search of the house, on search and seizure warrant. About ₹8/- crores of cash was found in the house, apart from several kilograms of gold. ₹8/- crores of cash was counted throughout the night in the presence of the petitioner and the petitioner was produced before the 13th Additional Metropolitan Magistrate at Hyderabad seeking transit warrant to bring him to the jurisdictional Magistrate at Bengaluru.

2.3. The learned Magistrate returns the request for transit warrant, since the petitioner was not named in the FIR. On 12-06-2024 when the transit warrant was returned, the Officers of Crime Investigation Department ('CID') bring the petitioner back to Bengaluru by road. On bringing him back to Bengaluru he was taken to medical checkup. After medical checkup he was produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate who orders him to be taken to

police custody. The petitioner, on being taken into police custody, approaches this Court in Writ Petition No.14252 of 2025 calling in question his arrest on 11-06-2024 as illegal and consequently seeking release of the petitioner from judicial custody then. As a ground thereof, the remand order dated 26-06-2024 was sought to be quashed. A coordinate Bench of this Court in terms of its order dated 12-06-2025 dismissed the petition. The dismissal of the petition has become final. A week after dismissal of the petition, the subject petition is preferred by the petitioner seeking quashment of the entire proceedings *inter alia*, seeking the relief that was already sought in the aforesaid petition.

4. Heard Sri Rajesh Mahale, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner, Sri B.N. Jagadeesha, learned Additional State Public Prosecutor appearing for respondents 1 and 2 and Sri Vikram Huilgol, learned senior counsel appearing for respondent No.3.

5. The learned senior counsel Sri Rajesh Mahale appearing for the petitioner would vehemently contend that gist of the allegations against the petitioner is that he has conspired with Accused Nos.2,

11 and 12. The allegations against the petitioner are completely omnibus. There is no amount that is credited into the account of the petitioner nor taken out of his account. The allegation is that about ₹90/- crores is fraudulently transferred to accounts opened in the names of fictitious business entities to which the petitioner has helped. The further allegation is that the petitioner has received part of the money through accused No.3 in the form of cash and gold, while the allegation is hugely of conspiracy. There is no direct allegation against the petitioner. These are the submissions in support of seeking quashment of proceedings.

5.1. In support of the release of the petitioner from prison where he is for the last 14 months, the jurisdictional Magistrate has declined to grant transit warrant. When the transit warrant was declined, close to 48 hours the petitioner was not produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate at Bangalore. Therefore, the arrest of the petitioner become illegal. He would also contend that the petitioner was neither provided with grounds of arrest nor the prosecution had a transit warrant to transport the petitioner to Bengaluru from Hyderabad. On all these grounds, the learned

senior counsel seeks quashment of proceedings or to hold the arrest as illegal and consequently release him on grant of bail forthwith.

6. Per contra, learned Additional State Public Prosecutor Sri B.N. Jagadeesha would take this Court through the objections filed countering every one of the submissions. It is the contention of the learned Additional State Public Prosecutor that the house of the petitioner was searched at 11.30 p.m. on 11-06-2024. Search yielded ₹8/- crores in cash and several kilograms of gold and counting of cash took about 8 hours. The petitioner was then immediately produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate who returned the transit warrant on the ground that the petitioner was not named as an accused. The prosecution had no choice. They had to carry ₹8/- crores cash back to Bengaluru along with the petitioner. The travel took ten hours by road. The moment they landed in Bengaluru, the petitioner was subjected to medical examination and after medical examination produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate who ordered police custody of the petitioner.

6.1. The police, after investigation, filed a charge sheet and now the petitioner is accused No.1, the key conspirator of largescale misappropriation of funds of the Corporation which runs to the tune of ₹188/- crores. The learned Additional State Public Prosecutor would contend that the petitioner has urged these very grounds before the coordinate Bench in the aforementioned writ petition which comes to be dismissed. The dismissal of it has become final. Now on the ground of alleged illegal arrest and non-furnishing of grounds of arrest, the petitioner is again before this Court. He would submit that the second petition under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., without any change in circumstance, is not maintainable nor entertainable. The learned Additional State Public Prosecutor would submit that it is settled principle of law that grounds that were not urged in the earlier petition cannot become grounds in the subsequent petition under Section 482 of the CrPC. In all, he would seek dismissal of the petition.

FOR THE COMPLAINANT:

7. Sri Vikram Huilgol, learned senior counsel, lent support to the submissions of the State, contending that the public exchequer

and the scheduled tribes have been dealt a grievous blow. The learned senior counsel submits that the offences are so grave, conspiracy writ large would necessarily demand a full trial and not premature termination of proceedings.

8. The learned senior counsel for the petitioner would join issue in contending that what was challenged in the earlier petition was only to declare the arrest of the petitioner on 11-06-2024 as illegal on several grounds raised therein. Now the entire criminal proceedings is sought to be quashed. Therefore, the second petition with the quashment prayer is undoubtedly maintainable.

9. Both the learned senior counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional State Public Prosecutor have relied on certain judgments in support of their respective contentions, all of which would bear consideration in the course of the order *qua* their relevance.

10. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made by the respective learned counsel and have perused the

material on record. In furtherance whereof, the following issues arise for my consideration:

- (i) Whether a second petition invoking the jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. on grounds that were available while filing the first petition would be maintainable?**
- (ii) If maintainable, whether the arrest of the petitioner could be held to be illegal, resulting in his release from custody?**
- (iii) Whether interference in exercise of jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS (482 of the Cr.P.C.) is warranted?**

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES:

Issue No.1:

- (i) Whether a second petition invoking the jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. on grounds that were available while filing the first petition would be maintainable?**

Brief facts towards consideration of the issue:

11. The link in the chain of events are required to be iterated. A huge alleged scam to the tune of ₹188/- crores blue up pursuant to a complaint registered on 28-05-2024 which becomes a crime in Crime No.118 of 2024. A little history to the registration of crime is that, a newly opened account in the Bank in the name of the Corporation gets deposits of ₹188/- crores by 5 transactions and by 18 transactions it is transferred to various business entities. The moneies had to be dispensed to the poor, as it was a Corporation for development of members of Scheduled Tribes. The poor does not get the money, it goes nowhere near those beneficiaries, but gets into fictitious accounts. This serious foul play is noticed by the Corporation itself. This triggered registration of the complaint by the Corporation. The complaint so made on 28-05-2024 before the High Grounds Police Station reads as follows:

"To,

Date: 28th May 2024

Station House Officer,
High Grounds Police Station,
Bengaluru

Subject: Complaint against Ms. A. Manimekhalai, MD & CEO, Union Bank of India, Sri. Nitesh Ranjan, Sri. Ramasubramaniam, Shri. Sanjay Rudra, Shri. Pankaj Dwivedi, the Executive Directors, Mrs. Suchishitha Raul, Chief Manager of Union Bank of India, MG Road Branch, Bengaluru, and other involved parties

Dear Sir,

I am writing on behalf of Karnataka Maharishi Valmiki Parishista Pangadagala Abhivruddi Nigama (KMVSTDCL), a government organization having its registered office at No. 10, 3rd Floor, Khadi Bhavan, Jasma Devi Bhavan Road, Bangalore 560052. As the General Manager, I am lodging a formal complaint regarding severe fraudulent activities involving the top management of Union Bank of India officials/employees of Union Bank of India, MG Road Branch, Bengaluru, and other third parties, which have caused substantial financial and reputational damage to our organization.

On 19th February 2024, KMVSTDCL ("**Organisation**") transferred its account from Union Bank of India, Vasanthnagar branch to Union Bank of India, MG Road Branch, Bangalore (Account No. 520141001659653, the account, named "**MANAGING DIRECTOR, KARNATAKA MAHARISHI VALMIKI SCHEDULE TRIBES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED, BENGALURU,**" was to be jointly operated by the Managing Director and the Accounts Officer, as per the signatures procured by the concerned bank officials on 26th February 2024.

The account received several significant deposits as follows:

1. Rs. 25 crore on 4th March 2024
2. Rs. 25 crore on 6th March 2024
3. Rs. 44 crore on 21st March 2024
4. Rs. 43.33 crore on 22nd March 2024
5. Rs. 50 crore on 21st May 2024

These deposits, totalling Rs. 187.33 crore, were made from various banks and the State Huzur Treasury Khajane-II into

our Savings Bank account No.520141001659653 at Union Bank of India, MG Road Branch, Bangalore.

Due to the election code of conduct, our office did not communicate with Union Bank of India, MG Road Branch. Consequently, the bank failed to send the new passbook and cheque book to our registered address. Our officials visited the branch on 21st May 2024 to collect these documents but were refused by the branch officer, who later visited our office on 22nd May 2024 claiming the documents were already issued which was found to be untrue.

Further perusal it revealed numerous forged letters, forged cheques, and forged RTGS requests with fake signatures of the officers and Accounts Officer, forged/fake board resolution leading to unauthorized disbursements of funds from the organisation's bank account. Upon verification of the passbook in detail an amount of Rs. 94,73,08,500/- has been disbursed to various accounts by Union Bank of India, MG Road Branch, Bengaluru, based on the forged documents. These forged include:

- a. An authorization letter dated 4th March 2024 authorizing Mr. Shiva Kumar Junior Accounts Officer, to manage the account who is unknown to our organisation (**Document No. 1**).
- b. A letter dated 4th March 2024 falsely indicating receipt of the cheque book by our organization (**Document No. 2**).
- c. **Copies of RTGS request letters and cheque copies showing printed signatures of managing Director and Account officer (Document No. 31)**
- d. **Additionally, a fake/forged board resolution dated 30th March 2024 was created to deposit Rs. 50 crore in a fixed deposit and secure an overdraft facility against it (Document No. 4). This resolution and related documents bear forged signatures and were used to transfer Rs.**

**40.10 crore to various accounts on the same day
(Document No. 5).**

The copies of the bank statement dated 30th March 2024 to 24th May 2024 clearly reflect such transaction is enclosed **(Document no.6)**

The involved bank officials have not addressed any emails to our registered email ID i.e., _____ despite it being clearly stated on our original letterhead. Additionally, the official phone number of the Managing Director has not been recorded by the bankers, in view of the same our office has not been informed of any of the transactions.

The top management of Union Bank of India, Mrs. Suchishitha Raul, Chief Manager have failed to address these illegalities and have continued acting in such illegal manner being fully aware of such fraudulent acts being carried out by the branch officials and other third party/ies, wherein there is evident failure in following the banking procedure. Further the bank itself has failed to take the precautionary measures with respect to the fact that funds are being held in their bank, the top management of Union Bank of India is to be held liable for the several lapses that have transpired in the Bank.

Further upon being made aware of these acts, one of the employees of our organisation i.e. Sri. Chandrashekar P, who was working as the Account Superintendent in our organisation was involved in coordinating for necessary documents (*bank confirmation letters, Cheque book, RTGS letters, bank statements etc.,*) to be procured and to be handed over to the bankers from the organisation, committed suicide by naming the Managing Director, Accounts officer and the Chief manager in the suicide note. It is pertinent to note that the concerned officer i.e., Sri Chandrashekar P was involved in sending out bank confirmation letter to various banks where our organisation has held the accounts to assert the bank balance had failed to send out the letters to Union Bank of India, MG Road Branch Bengaluru every month to ascertain the monthly balance.

Upon discovery of these fraudulent activities, our organisation took immediate steps:

- a. On 23rd May 2024 we addressed a letter to the Chief Manager highlighting the various illegalities that had transpired in their bank, immediately a sum of Rs.5 Crore was deposited into our account which came to be informed to us by the bank officials on the same date we requested into provide the banks CCTV footage of the bank, which has not been received till data. (**Document no.7**)
- b. On 27th May 2024, we addressed a letter to the Deputy General Manager (East) Union Bank of India, Bengaluru to ensure all the amounts are redeposited into our account immediately. (**Document no.8**)

Further the bank itself has failed to take the precautionary measures while the funds are being held in their bank and the top management of Union Bank of India is to held liable for the several lapse that have transpired in their banking system. Wherein they have failed to verify the account details, the signatures on the cheques, the same amounts to sheer lapses on part of Union Bank of India before the funds are disbursed from the account held in Union Bank of India, MG Road Branch, Bengaluru, The ongoing fraudulent activities and oversight indicate a systemic failure within the Union Bank of India, necessitating a comprehensive investigation into the involvement and negligence of the top management which includes the Managing Director, Chief Executive Office and Executive Directors of Union Bank of India, namely i.e., Ms. A.Manimekhalai, MD & CEO, Union Bank of India. Sri. Nitesh Ranjan, Sri Ramasubramanium, Shri. Sanjay Rudra, Shri. Pankaj Dwivedi, the Executive Directors.

It is appalling to the organisation to be made aware of such illegal acts at such related stage, that without the physical presence of any of the officers of the organisation, without physical verification with the Managing Director of the Accounts officers such huge

loans amounts and overdrafts facility have been created by a nationalised bank. Given the blatant illegal acts committed by the top management bank officials, we request immediate action against Ms. A. Manimekhalal MD & CEO Union Bank of India Sri Nitesh Ranjan, Sri Ramasubramaniam, Sri Sanjay Rudra, Sri Pankaj Dwivedi, the Executive Directors, Mrs. Suchishitha Raul, the Chief Manager of Union Bank of India. MG road Branch, Bengaluru and other involved parties.

We urge you to conduct a thorough investigation, hold the responsible top management of Union Bank of India, officers at the Union Bank of India, MG Road Branch accountable, and initiate legal proceedings under relevant sections of the Indian Penal Code, including Sections 420 against the top management, bank officials for adopting fraudulent means to induce unauthorised transfer and disbursement of funds and causing loss to the government by failing to follow the banking norms. section 467 for creating forged documents, including authorization letters and boards resolution, forgery of valuable security, section 468 for creating documents with the intention to deceive and cheat our organisation and leading to significant financial loss. section 471 since the bank officials used forged documents as genuine, knowing them to be false, Section 409 for committing criminal breach of trust by misappropriating the funds and other provisions of law."

(Emphasis added)

The concatenation of events discloses a conspiracy of staggering proportions. The complaint *supra* narrates how funds meant for the amelioration of the scheduled tribes were siphoned off into shadowy accounts. Most of the people

who are now drawn as accused were not drawn as accused at that time. The accused were only 6 people who are officials of the Bank. Pursuant to registration of crime, the Police began to conduct investigation. The conduct of investigation leads to several arrests being made who were not named in the FIR. One such person was the petitioner. **It is here the petitioner is brought into the vortex of crime. The petitioner is a resident of Hyderabad. The Crime Investigation Department armed with a search and seizure warrant, search the residence of the petitioner at Hyderabad, in a nocturnal operation stretching into dawn. The sleuths unearthed an astonishing Rs.8 crores in cash and about 15 kilograms of gold.** Immediately after completion of counting, the petitioner was produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate seeking of a transit warrant. On the ground that the petitioner is not an accused, the transit warrant so sought at the hands of the jurisdictional Magistrate at Hyderabad comes to returned. The prosecution had no choice but to travel to jurisdictional Court at Bengaluru and take further steps in the matter. They travelled all night to come to Bengaluru, under took medical examination of the petitioner as is required in law and

produced him before the jurisdictional Magistrate. The jurisdictional Magistrate grants police custody on 12-06-2024.

12. The police conduct investigation, draw the petitioner as accused No.1 and file a charge sheet against several persons. The allegation against the petitioner runs into 10 pages. It reads as follows:

“ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿಗಳ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಆರೋಪಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಗಾದಿರಾಜು ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ್

ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ್ ಈತನು ಮೂಲತಃ ತೆಲಂಗಾಣ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್‌ನವನಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಈತನು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿಗೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ. 12.10.2023 ಮತ್ತು 15.10.2023. 16.10.2023 ರಿಂದ 18.10.2023 ವರೆಗೆ ಭೇಟಿ ನೀಡಿ ಮಾನ್ಯತಾ ಟೆಕ್ ಪಾರ್ಕ್ ಸಮೀಪದ ಹೋಟೆಲ್ ರಾಯಲ್ ಏಸ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಹೋಟೆಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ನಂತರದ ದಿನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲೇ ಪರಿಚಯವಿದ್ದ ಅಂಧಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಗುಂಟೂರು ನಗರದ ಆರೋಪಿ-2 ಕಾಕಿ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸರಾವ್ ರವರು ವಾಸವಿರುವ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ತನಗೆ ಹಲವಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಪರಿಚಯವಿದ್ದ ಆರೋಪಿ-11 ನಾಗೇಶ್ವರ ರಾವ್ ರವರ ಮೂಲಕ ಆತನ ಭಾವನಾದ ಆರೋಪಿ-12 ನೆಕ್ಕಂಟಿ ನಾಗರಾಜ್‌ನನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಮಹರ್ಷಿ ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡಗಳ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜಿಂಗ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದ ಆರೋಪಿ-5 ಪದ್ಮನಾಭ್‌ನನ್ನು ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಿ, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮಹರ್ಷಿ ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡಗಳ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ನಿಗಮಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಖಾತೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಲಪಟಾಯಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಪರಾಧಿಕ ಒಳ ಸಂಚು ನಡೆಸಿ. ಸುಮಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಪರಿಚಯವಿದ್ದ ಆರೋಪಿ-7 ಚಂದ್ರಮೋಹನ್ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ. ರಸ್ತೆ ಶಾಖೆ, ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರ್‌ರವರನ್ನು ಪರಿಚಯ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು, ಅವರ ಮೂಲಕ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮಹರ್ಷಿ ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡಗಳ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಎಂ.ಡಿ., ಆರೋಪಿ-5 ಪದ್ಮನಾಭ್‌ರವರ ಮೂಲಕ ವಸಂತನಗರ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಶಾಖೆಯಿಂದ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಎಂ.ಜಿ. ರಸ್ತೆ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ತೆರೆಸಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಹಣ ರೂ. 89,62,99,500/- ನ್ನು ವಂಚನೆಯ ಮೂಲಕ ನಕಲಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ದಾಖಲಾತಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಿ ಖಾತೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆರೆದು, ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಜಸ್ಮಾದೇವಿ ಭವನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮಹರ್ಷಿ ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡಗಳ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಕಛೇರಿ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರೆ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಪರಸ್ಪರ ದೂರವಾಣಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ತಾಣಗಳ ಮೂಲಕ ನಿರಂತರ ಸಂಪರ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ಒಳ ಸಂಚು ರೂಪಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ್ ಈ ಮೊದಲೇ ಪರಿಚಯವಿದ್ದ ಆರೋಪಿ-2 ಕಾಕಿ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸನ ಜೊತೆ ಸೇರಿ ತನ್ನ ಸಹಚರನಾದ ಆರೋಪಿ-4 ಸಾಯಿ ತೇಜ ದೇವರಪಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಮರೆಮಾಚಿ ಶಿವಕುಮಾರ್ ಎಂಬ ನಿಗಮದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ಆಧಾರ್ ಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ನಿಗಮದ ಗುರುತಿನ ಚೀಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಟ್ಯಾಗ್‌ನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-2 ಕಾಕಿ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸರಾವ್‌ರ ಸಹಾಯದಿಂದ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿದ ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಗುರುತಿನ ಚೀಟಿಯನ್ನು ನೀಡಿ, ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ. ರಸ್ತೆ ಶಾಖೆಗೆ ನಿಗಮದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯಂತೆ (ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಯಾಗಿ) ನಟಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತರಬೇತಿ ನೀಡಿ, ತಮ್ಮ ಬಳಿ ಇದ್ದ ಆರೋಪಿ-5 ಪದ್ಮನಾಭ ನಿಂದ ಆತನ ಸಹಿ ಮತ್ತು ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-6 ಪರಶುರಾಮ ದುರುಗಣ್ಣನವರವರ ಸಹಿಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಫಾರಂನ್ನು ಆತನಿಗೆ ನೀಡಿ, ಆರೋಪಿ-7 ಚಂದ್ರಮೋಹನ್ ರವರ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ, ಎಂ.ಜಿ. ರಸ್ತೆ, ಶಾಖೆಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡಗಳ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 520141001659653 ಯನ್ನು ತೆರೆಯಲು ಸಂಚುರೂಪಿಸಿ. ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ. ದಿನಾಂಕ: 20.02.2024 ರಂದು ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ದಾಖಲಾತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-5 ಪದ್ಮನಾಭ ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-6 ಪರಶುರಾಮ ಇವರುಗಳ ಸಹಿ ಪಡೆದು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಈ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-5 ಪದ್ಮನಾಭ ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-11 ನಾಗೇಶ್ವರರಾವ್ ರವರು ಪರಸ್ಪರ ಸಂಪರ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ಒಳ ಸಂಚು ನಡೆಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮುಂದುವರೆದು ದಿನಾಂಕ: 21.02.2024 ರಂದು ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಬರೋಡಾ ಖಾತೆಯಿಂದ ರೂ. 25 ಕೋಟಿಗಳನ್ನು ಎಂ.ಜಿ ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಹರ್ಷಿ ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಖಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 520141001659653 ಖಾತೆಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆರೋಪಿ-5 ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-6 ರವರ ಮೂಲಕ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 26.02.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾನು ಆರೋಪಿ-11 ನಾಗೇಶ್ವರ ರಾವ್ ಜೊತೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ಒಳಸಂಚು ನಡೆಸಿ. ಆರೋಪಿ-7 ಚಂದ್ರಮೋಹನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರ್ ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕ ಸಾಧಿಸಿ ಮುಂದಿನ ಹಣ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂಚು ರೂಪಿಸಿ, ಅದರಂತೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 04.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 25 ಕೋಟಿಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಬರೋಡಾ. ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಉಳಿತಾಯ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 12510100006588 ಖಾತೆಯಿಂದ ಎಂ.ಜಿ ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 520141001659653 ಗೆ ಆರೋಪಿ-5 ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-6 ರವರ ಮೂಲಕ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು, ತಕ್ಷಣವೇ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 05.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ ಆರೋಪಿ-11 ನಾಗೇಶ್ವರರಾವ್ ರವರ ಜೊತೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಸಾಧಿಸಿ. ಸಂಚು

ನಡೆಸಿ ಆತನು ಆರೋಪಿ-12 ನೆಕ್ಕುಂಟಿ ನಾಗರಾಜ್ ಜೊತೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-7 ಚಂದ್ರಮೋಹನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರ್ ಮೂಲಕ ರೂ. 4,97,83,000/- ನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಸ್ವಾದೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ Zelliant Tradaing and Consulting Services ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010055200008 ಖಾತೆಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯು ಉಮ್ಯಾನ್ ನೈನ್ ಸರ್ವರ್‌ಖಾನ್ ನಂ. 107, ಡಾಲರ್ಸ್ ಸ್ಕ್ವೇಮ್ ಕಾಲೋನಿ. 34 ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ಬಿ.ಟಿ.ಎಂ. ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಸ್ಟೇಜ್, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-560068 ಮೊ.ಸಂ. 9844170588 ರವರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಸಾನಿ ವೆಂಕಟಸುಬ್ಬರಾವ್ ನಂ. 107, ಡಾಲರ್ಸ್ ಸ್ಕ್ವೇಮ್ ಕಾಲೋನಿ, 34 ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ಬಿ.ಟಿ.ಎಂ. ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಸ್ಟೇಜ್, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-560068 ಮೊ.ಸಂ. 7080200363 ಎಂಬ ನಕಲಿ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ವಿಷಯವಾದ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010055200008 ನಂಬರ್ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.05.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 4,97,83,000/- ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿದ್ದು, ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Ram karthik - 4,00,00,000/-, Sri Nagendra traders: 20,00,000/- Nageshwara Rao: 27,00,000/-, Bhimarapu Venkata Sai Phaninder Reddy: 50,00,000/-, Pittala srinivas: 25,00,000/-, Paratopia E-Commeree Pvt Ltd.,: 1,50,00,000/-, PK enterprises: 50,00,000/-, Shourya Globals: 10,00,000/-, Battala sravana Kumari: 5,00,000/-, Battala vijay Kumar: 5,00,000/-, Nirmal Kumar lakshmkanth: 35,00,000/-, Chahath Production: 15,00,000/-, Siddi Jewellers: 37,00,011/-, Happiest Minds Technologies Limited: 22,99,792/-, Meruva Srilatha. 20,00,000/-, Pifums Management P Ltd: 2,00,00,000/-, Rathnakumari Kona: 25,00,000/-, Srimant Pirumala Gudimell: 25,00,000/-, Suveenaleti: 2,80,000/- Venkatarao Kona:12,00,000/- ರವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಇತರ ಖಾತೆಗಳಿಗೆ internal transactions ಮೂಲಕ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದು ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳಿಂದ ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ "ಆರೋಪಿ -9 ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ರೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿದ್ದು, ಮತ್ತು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಕಲಿ ದಾಖಲಾತಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿಗೆ ನೀಡಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾತೆ ತೆರೆಯಲು ಸಹಕರಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 05.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ್ ಆರೋಪಿ-11 ನಾಗೇಶ್ವರಾವ್ ರವರ ಜೊತೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಾಧಿಸಿ. ಆತನು ಆರೋಪಿ-12 ನೆಕ್ಕುಂಡಿ ನಾಗರಾಜ್ ಜೊತೆ

ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-7 ಚಂದ್ರಮೋಹನ್‌ನು ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ, ಎಂ.ಜಿ. ರಸ್ತೆ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರ್ ಮೂಲಕ ರೂ. 5,35,15,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು, ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಸ್ವಾದೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010055200007 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ PIFUMS Management Pvt Ltd ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಮಾಲೀಕ ಅರುಣಾ ಬಾಲಕೃಷ್ಣ ರೈ ಮತ್ತು ವಿನೋದ್ ಗೋವಿಂದಯ್ಯ ಮೊ.ಸಂ. 9448506470 ಎಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಸಾನಿ ಗೀತಿಕಾ ನಂ.147/1, ಬೇಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್, 20ನೇ ಮೈನ್, ಮೊದಲನೇ ಸ್ಟೇಜ್, ಬಿ.ಟಿ.ಎಂ. ಲೇಔಟ್, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-68 ಮೊ.ಸಂ. 7080500819 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್‌ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ವಿಜಯವಾಡ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010055200007 ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.05.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 5,35,15,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ SLS Building: 1,10,00,000/-, Chagenti Surendra Reddy: 1,00,00,000/-, Ram Karthik Project: 6,90,00,000/-, Siddi Jewellers: 39,00,000/- SLS building: 1,10,00,000/-, Sravan Kumar Reddy: 5,00,000/-, Zelliant Trading: 2,00,500/-, Bali reddy B: 2,44,0000/-, Rajesh Edlapalli, 4,18,600/- ರವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಇತರ ಖಾತೆಗಳಿಗೆ internal transactions ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-9 ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಅಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ರೇವೆನು ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಮೂಲಕ ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭ ಪಡೆದು ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿ ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 07.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ್‌ನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅಪರಾಧಿಕ ಒಳ ಸಂಚಿನಂತೆ ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಬರೋಡಾ ಖಾತೆಯಿಂದ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಎಂ.ಜಿ. ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ರೂ. 25 ಕೋಟಿ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಅದೇ ದಿನ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ್ ಆರೋಪಿ-11 ನಾಗೇಶ್ವರಾವ್ ರವರ ಜೊತೆ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಾಧಿಸಿ. ಆತನು ಆರೋಪಿ-12 ನೆಕ್ಕುಂಟಿ ನಾಗರಾಜ್ ಜೊತೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಸಂಚುರೂಪಿಸಿ, ಆರೋಪಿ-7 ಚಂದ್ರಮೋಹನ್‌ನು ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ, ಎಂ.ಜಿ. ರಸ್ತೆ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರ್ ಮೂಲಕ ರೂ. 4,53,15,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಮಾಲೀಕತ್ವದ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010055200010 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ Happiest Mind Technologies Limited ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ

ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಮಾಲೀಕ ವೆಂಕಟರಮಣ ಎನ್. ಮೊ.ಸಂ. 9900264107 ಎಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ರಂಕಿ ರೆಡ್ಡಿ ದುರ್ಗಾರಾವ್, ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ:53, 1234, ಹೊಸೂರು ಮೇನ್ ರೋಡ್. ಮಡಿವಾಳ, ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9048903241 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ವಿಜಯವಾಡ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 0005010 055200010 ನಂವರ್ ನ ಜಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.07.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ.4,53,15,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ A1 Top Up Services 10,00,000/- Accord Business Services : 47,61,000/- Aithagoni Vasu Gowda: 5,00,000/-, Abhishekh reddy 4,00,000/- Battala sravana Kumari :10,00,000/-, Battala Vikjaya Kumara: 4,00,000/-, Bomma Anil Kumar Reddy: 7,50,000/-, Chaganti surendra Reddy: 1,00,00,000/-, Chandra Mohan: 5,00,000/-, Dama Jyothi: 5,00,000/-, Deepak Kumar: 22,00,00,000/- Gallappalli kishore Kumar Reddy: 40,00,000/-, Gundala Ravi: 2,50,000/-, Guntur Goutham: 15,00,000/-, HGS Infracon: 90,00,000/-, Jagadeesha: 5,00,000/-, K Naveen Kumar Reddy: 10,00,000/-, K. Ravi: 6,00,000/-, KGR Rigs and Mines: 9,00,000/-, Kovoor Jayachandra Reddy: 15,00,000/-, Krishnappa: 5,00,000/-, Lakshmi: 25,00,000/-, Chandramohan M: 5,00,000/-, Mahaveer Impe 1,00,00,000/-, Valmiki Nigama: 71,75,000/-, Mukhtapuram Lokavardhan: 5,00,000/-, Nirmala: 4,00,000/-, Obedient Trading: 1,89,00,000/-, P. Venkatarao: 5,00,000/-, Akkeeru Venkatareddy: 6,50,000/-, Pradeep Rao: 5,00,000/-, Puri Mahesh Kumar 2,90,000/-, Ram Karthik Projects 2,38,00,000/-, Ravi Kumar kukkadapu: 5,00,000/-, Shobha K: 4,00,000/-, Siddi Jewellers: 77,85,003/-, Sony Techno 10,00,000/-, Soujanya H.E: 10,00,000/-, Sri Peddamma Thali Wines: 20,00,000/-, Sri Venkatalakshmi Borewell: 10,00,00/-, Srihitha Shopping Services; 50,00,000/-, Srihitha Shopping services LTD FF: 4,20,00,000/-, Uthi Poojitha: 15,00,000/-, Velma Suresh: 45,00,000/-, Vinod Kumar Giddaluri: 10,00,000/-, Zelliant Trading And consulting services 12,00,5000/- ರವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಇತರ ಖಾತೆಗಳಿಗೆ internal transactions ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವಹಿವಾಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-9 ತೇಜತಮಟಮ್ ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಗದಿರಾಜ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ರೇವೆನುಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿ ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಅದೇ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 07.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ ರವರ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 5.46,85,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಮಾಲೀಕತ್ವದ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ:

00015010055200009 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ Accord Business Services ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಮಾಲೀಕ ಮಹೇಶ್‌ಕುಮಾರ್ ಮೊ.ಸಂ.8748960999 ಎಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೋಯಾವಿಶ್ವನಾಥ್, ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ.88/26. 1ನೇ ಮಹಡಿ, ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ ಬಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್, ತಾವರೆಕೆರೆ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ಬಸ್ ಸ್ಟಾಂಡ್ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-21 ಮೊ.ಸಂ. 6026137043 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ವಿಜಯವಾಡ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010055200009 ನಂಬರ್ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.07.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 5,46,85,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Chikas Enterprises: 90,00,000/- , Srinivas Rao: 10,00,000/-Battala Savithramma: 20,00,000/-, Battala sravana kumari:10,00,000/-, Battala Titupathaiiah: 30,00,000/-, Battala Vijaya Kumara: 5,00,000/-, Brahmareddy: 9,90,000/- Rajeshwar Reddy: 3,93,750/-, Chaithanya Bennehalli: 7,54,600/-, Coastal Trading: 1,89,00,000/-, Deepak Kumar: 1,00,00,000/-, E Nageshwar Rao: 31,00,000/-, Pravin Kumar reddy: 3,02,600/-, Gopikrishna: 1,70,000/- Gubala Amaranath 10,00,000/-, Gubala gangadhara; 10,00,000/-, Happiest Minds technologies: 30,00,000/- Gudapathi sandeep Kumar: 1,50,000/-, Jagadeesh: 5,00,000/-, Jasmine Khan: 1,96,000/-, Raghav Reddy: 3,15,000/-, Krishnappa: 5,00,000/-, Valmiki Nigama: 2,00,00,000/- (Return amount) Medicare Medical & Gen: 3,00,000/-, Mudra drilling Equipements: 30,00,000/-, Mukhthapuram Gopala: Makhthapur Nokavardhan: 15,00,000/- Nalla Vikas reddy: 25,00,000/-, PIFUMS Management Pvt. Ltd 2,00,02,000/-, Pittala Srinivas; 43,00,000/-, Pradeep Mohan: 1,40,150/-, Prasanna Kumar S: 92,500/-,Raghavendra R: 1,24,400/-, Ram Karthik projeets: 2,20,00,000/-, Sangam Soujanya: 1,43,800/-, Sandeep Kumar Paladi: 2,61,500/-, Serena vivek kanthi mohan: 5,00,000/-, Sobha K: 10,00,000/-, Sham enterprises: 54,500/-, Siddi Jewellers: 80,00.501/-. Sridevi constructions: 98,000/-, Srihitha Shopping Services: 90,00,000/-, Sumith Cowman: 5,00,000/-, V6 Business Solutions: 6,00,000/-, Venkataramana Mukhthapura: 15,00,000/-, Soujanya Ram: 2,22,000/-, Zellliant Trading and consulting: 4,91,00,000/-ರವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಇತರ ಖಾತೆಗಳಿಗೆ internal transactions ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ್‌ನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಅಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಠೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿ ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಅದೇ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 07.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ರವರ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 5,01,50,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಸ್ವಾದೀನದ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ Manhu Enterprises ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010055200005 ನ್ನು ತೆರೆಸಿದ್ದ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯು ಎಂ.ಸುರೇಶ್ ಕುಮಾರ್ ಮೊ.ಸಂ.8970185684 ಎಂಬವರಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಬಳಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ದೇವಬೋಯಿನಾ ಬಾಬು ರಾವ್. ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ. 12. 7ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ಚಿಕ್ಕಾಡುಗೋಡಿ. ಡಿ.ಆರ್.ಸಿ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್-ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-29, ಮೊ.ಸಂ. 7080500812 ಎಂಬ ದಾಖಲಾತಿಯನ್ನು ನಕಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ. ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ವಿಜಯವಾಡ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010055200005 ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ.07.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 5,01,50,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Accord Business services : 3,01,48,000/-, Happiest Minds and technologies Ltd.,: 2,00,00,000/-, Siddi jewelers: 31,00,017/- ರವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಇತರ ಖಾತೆಗಳಿಗೆ internal transactions ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯ ನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ರೇವಣ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿ ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಅದೇ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 07.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ್ ನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ, ಎಂ.ಜಿ. ರಸ್ತೆ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ನಿಗಮದ ಖಾತೆಯಿಂದ ರೂ. 4,98,50,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಸ್ವಾದೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010055200006 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ Y M Enterprises ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯು ಮೋಹನ್ ಎಂ. ಮೊ.ಸಂ.8147949148 ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಸಾನಿ. ಸುಜಾತ, ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ. ನಂ.39. ಜೋಗಿ ಕಾಲೋನಿ, 3ನೇ ಕ್ರಾಸ್, ಅಣ್ಣಯ್ಯಮ್ಮ ಮಂದಿರ, ಮಡಿವಾಳ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-68 ಮೊ.ಸಂ. 7080300495 ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಕಲಿ ದಾಖಲಾತಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ವಿಜಯವಾಡ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010055200006 ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.07.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 4,98,50,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ

ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ PIFUMS management Pvt. Ltd.: 4,98,48,000/-, Siddi Jewelles: 30,99,929 ರವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಇತರ ಖಾತೆಗಳಿಗೆ internal transactions ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಿಕಾರಿಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟೆಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಠೇವಣಿಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿ ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 11.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-11 ನಾಗೇಶ್ವರ ರಾವ್, ಆರೋಪಿ-12 ನೆಕ್ಕಂಟಿ ನಾಗರಾಜ್ ಜೊತೆ ಒಳಸಂಚು ನಡೆಸಿ, ಆ ಮೂಲಕ ಯೂನಿಯ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಿಂದ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮ ರವರ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 5,12,50,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಿಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010145200195 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ Volta Technology Solutions ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯು ಸನಲ್ ಜೆ ರೀನಾ ಟಾಂ ಫಿರೇರಾ ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9449038973 ಎಂಬ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಗಂಸುಧೀರ್ ರೆಡ್ಡಿ, ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ. 77. ನೆಲಮಹಡಿ, 10ನೇ ಕ್ರಾಸ್, 20 ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ಗಂಗೋತ್ರಿ ಸರ್ಕಲ್ ಹತ್ತಿರ, ಬಿ.ಟಿ.ಎಂ. 1ನೇ ಹಂತ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-68 ಮೊ.ಸಂ. 7080500819 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿ ದಾಖಲಾತಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ವಿಜಯವಾಡ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010145200195 ನಂಬರ್ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.11.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 5,12,50,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Accord Business services: 2,00,00,000/-, Happiest Minds Technologies Limited: 2,12,48,000/-, Zeliant Training And Consulting Services: 1,00,00,000/-, Siddhi Jewellers: 35,00,013/- ರವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಇತರ ಖಾತೆಗಳಿಗೆ internal transactions ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟೆಕಿ ನಿಗಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡದ ಠೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿ ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಅದೇ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 11.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-11 ನಾಗೇಶ್ವರ ರಾವ್, ಆರೋಪಿ-12 ನೆಕ್ಕಂಟಿ ನಾಗರಾಜ್ ಜೊತೆ ಒಳಸಂಚು

ನಡೆಸಿ. ಆ ಮೂಲಕ ಯೂನಿಯ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಿಂದ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 4,47,50,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಸ್ವಾದೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೇವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010055200011 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ NITHYA SECURITY SERVICES ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯು ಎ.ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9535234330 ಎಂಬ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾರ್ತ್‌ಸುರೇಶ್ ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ. 3/7-3, 2ನೇ ಮಹಡಿ, 3ನೇ ಅಡ್ಡ ರಸ್ತೆ, ಹೊಸೂರು ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ಮಡಿವಾಳ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-68 ಮೊ.ಸಂ.7080200363 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿ ದಾಖಲೆಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೇವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010055200011 ನಂಬರ್ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.11.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 4,47,50,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Happiest Minds Technologies Limited 4,47,48,000/- ರವರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೇವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಇತರ ಖಾತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಭಾರತ internal transactions ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು "ಆರೋಪಿ-3" ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಠೇವಣಿಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿ ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 21.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-11 ನಾಗೇಶ್ವರ ರಾವ್, ಆರೋಪಿ-12 ನೆಕ್ಕಂಟಿ ನಾಗರಾಜ್ ಜೊತೆ ಒಳಸಂಚು ನಡೆಸಿ ಆ ಮೂಲಕ ಯೂನಿಯ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 520141001659653 ಗೆ ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಬರೋಡಾ ಖಾತೆಯಿಂದ ರೂ.44,00,00,000/- ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದು. ಇದಾದ ನಂತರ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ ರವರ ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-5 ಪದ್ಮನಾಭ ರವರ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಹುಜೂರ್ ಖಜಾನೆಯಿಂದ ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಎಂ.ಡಿ ಪದ್ಮನಾಭ ಆರೋಪಿ-5 ಮತ್ತು ಪರಶುರಾಮ ದುರುಗಣ್ಣನವರ್ ಆರೋಪಿ-6 ಒಳಸಂಚಿನಿಂದ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 25.03.2024 ರೂ. 43.33 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಅಕ್ರಮ ಹಣ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆಯಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 30.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 4,55,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಸ್ವಾದೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೇವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 000150

10145200202 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ System and Service Company ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ.ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಲಾದ ಓ.ಡಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ನಂ:034124010000007 ರಿಂದ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಮಾಲೀಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಉಮಾ ಕೆ.ಎಲ್. ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9844330032 ಎಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಮಹತಾಬ್ ಆಲಂ ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ.5. 1ನೇ ಫ್ಲೋರ್, 1ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ವಿಜಯನಗರ, ಎನ್.ಹೆಚ್.ಬಿ.ಸಿ.ಎಸ್ ಲೇಔಟ್, ಮಾರೇನ ಹಳ್ಳಿ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-560040 ಮೊ.ಸಂ.8009700515 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ವಿಜಯವಾಡ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010145200202 ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.30.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 4,55,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Happiest Minds Technologies Limited 4,54,97,250/- ರವರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಇತರ ಖಾತೆಗಳಿಗೆ internal transactions ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಗೆ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ರೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಅದೇ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 30.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 5,07,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಮಾಲೀಕತ್ವದ ಫಸ್ಟ್‌ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010145200203 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ Ram Enterprises ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ.ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಲಾದ ಓ.ಡಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ನಂ:034124010000007 ರಿಂದ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಖಾತೆದಾರ ವಿಜಯಕೃಷ್ಣ ಆರ್. ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9845039402 ಎಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ.19/58, ನೆಲಮಹಡಿ, 7ನೇ ಕ್ರಾಸ್, ಮಾಗಡಿ ರೋಡ್, ಮಂಜುನಾಥನಗರ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-560023 ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9048327961 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್‌ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010145200203 ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ 30.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ.5,07,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Accord Business Services 5,06,97,250 ರವರಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ

ವ್ಯವಹರಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವ್ಯವಹರಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಗೆ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಠೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಅದೇ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 30.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 4.84,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಸ್ವಾದೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010145200204 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ Skillmap Training and Services Pvt Ltd ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ.ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮಹರ್ಷಿ ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಲಾದ ಓ.ಡಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ನಂ:034124010000007 ರಿಂದ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯು ಜಾನಿ ಜೋಸೆಪ್ ಮೊ.ಸಂ.8593870077 ಎಂಬ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಆಶಿಫ್ ಆಲಿ ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ.9/9, 3ನೇ ಮಹಡಿ, 1ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ಚನ್ನಮ್ಮ ಬ್ಲಾಕ್. ಮಡಿವಾಳ, ಮಾರುತಿನಗರ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-68 ಮೊ.ಸಂ.8009300792 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿ ದಾಖಲೆಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010145200204 ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.30.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 4,84,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Happiest Minds Technologies Limited : 4,83,97,250/- ಖಾತೆಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯವಹರಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ@ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ@ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಗೆ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಠೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಅದೇ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 30.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ@ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 5.15,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಮಾಲೀಕತ್ವದ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010145200205 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ SWAP Design Pvt Ltd ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ.ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಲಾದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮಹರ್ಷಿ ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಓ.ಡಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ನಂ:034124010000007 ರಿಂದ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಖಾತೆದಾರ

ತುಂಬಾಲಂ ವೀರಸ್ವಾಮಿ ತಂದ್ರ ಚಕ್ರವರ್ತಿ ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9739158880 ಎಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಆಶಿಫ್ ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ-ಬಿ, 310, ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್.ವಿ.ಆರ್ ಹರ್ಬನ್ ಪ್ಲೋರಾ. ಕೈತೋಟ, ವೈಟ್ ಫೀಲ್ಡ್, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-56, ಮೊ.ಸಂ.8009300326 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ, ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010145200205 ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ 30.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 5.15.00.000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Accord Business Services: 5,14,97,250 ರವರಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಮಿಕ್ಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಗೆ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ರೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಕ್ರಮ ಕಾಶಗಳಿಸುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಅದೇ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 30.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ್ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 4,42,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಮಾಲೀಕತ್ವದ ಫಸ್ಟೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010145200206 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ G.N.Industries ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ.ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಲಾದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮಹರ್ಷಿ ವಾಲ್ಮಿಕ್ಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಓ.ಡಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ನಂ:034124010000007 ರಿಂದ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಮಾಲೀಕ ನವೀನ್ ಗುರುರಾಜ್ ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9845030183 ಎಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಬೇಗ್ ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ:36. ನೆಲ ಮಹಡಿ, 6ನೇ ಕ್ರಾಸ್, ಪೈಪ್‌ಲೈನ್ ಸರ್ವೀಸ್ ರಸ್ತೆ. ಜೈನ್ ದೇವಾಲಯ, ಚೋಲ್ಲರಪಾಳ್ಯ, ವಿಜಯನಗರ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-40. ಮೊ.ಸಂ.8009300359 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010145200206 ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.30.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 4,42,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Saranya Bullions: 2,00,00,000/-, Happiest Minds Technologies Limited: 25,91,090/-, Manhu Enterprises: 31,01,517/-, Nithya Security Services: 33,01,515, Pifums Management P Ltd: 39,00,509/-, Sujal Enterprises: 41,00,500/-, Volta Technology Solutions: 3501513, Zelian Training And Consulting Services :37,00,511/-ರವರಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ

ಇಟಕಾರಿಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಗೆ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಠೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಅದೇ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 30.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 4,56,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಮಾಲೀಕತ್ವದ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010145200207 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ Novel Security Serviceas pvt Ltd ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ.ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಲಾದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮಹರ್ಷಿ ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಓ.ಡಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ನಂ:34124010000007 ರಿಂದ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಮಾಲೀಕ ಡಿ.ಎಸ್.ರಾಘವೇಂದ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಆಶಾ ಪಿ. ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9448496654 ಎಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಮಿಟಾಜ್‌ಖಾನ್ ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ: 665/9, 3ನೇ ಕ್ರಾಸ್, 6ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ವಿಜಯನಗರ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-40. ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9005700476 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010145200207 ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.30.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 4,56,00,000/-,ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Coastal Trading: 45,60,000/-, Ganga Bhavani Agencies: 1,00,00,000/-, Happiest Minds Technologies Limited: 48,50,720/-, Obedient Trading: 45,60,000/-, Ramkarthik Projects And I: 90,00,000/-, Siddhi Jewellers: 65,24,495/-, Sujatha N: 10,00,000/-, Y M Enterprises : 31,01,429/- ರವರಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಗೆ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಠೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಅದೇ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ:30.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 5,63,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಮಾಲೀಕತ್ವದ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010145200208 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ Sujal Enterprises ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ.ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಲಾದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮಹರ್ಷಿ ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಓ.ಡಿ. ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ನಂ:034124010000007 ರಿಂದ

ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಖಾತೆದಾರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ರೇಖಾ ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9739593456 ಎಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲುವಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ ರೆಡ್ಡಿ ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ: 168. ಹಳೆ ನಂ.301, 8ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, 1ನೇ ಕ್ರಾಸ್, ವಿಜಯನಗರ, ಪೈಪ್‌ಲೈನ್ ರೋಡ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-40. ಮೊ.ಸಂ.8528987770 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫನ್ಡ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010145200208 ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.30.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 5,63,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Happiest Minds Technologies, Limited: 5,62,97,295/-, Siddhi Jewellers: 41,00,007/- ರವರಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಗೆ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ರೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಅದೇ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 30.03.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 5,88,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಮಾಲೀಕತ್ವದ ಫನ್ಡ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010145200209 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ Grab A Grub Services Pvt Ltd ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಯುನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ.ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಲಾದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮಹರ್ಷಿ ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಓಡಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ನಂ:034124010000007 ರಿಂದ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ, ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅವರ ಮಾಲೀಕ ಜಿಗಣೇಶ್ ಜಗದೀಶ್ ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ಮೊ.ಸಂ.8247007158 ಎಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಶಿಶ್ ಅನ್ವರ್ ಪೈಜಿ ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ: 190, ಟೆಲಿಕಾಂ ಎಂಪ್ಲಾಯಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಲೇಔಟ್, 7ನೇ ಕ್ರಾಸ್, 1ನೇ ಮೈನ್, ಗೋಪಾಲನ್ ರೆಸಿಡೆನ್ಸಿ ಎದುರು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-23. ಮೊ.ಸಂ.8009300175 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫನ್ಡ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010145200209 ನಂಬರ್ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.30.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 5,88.00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ Happiest Minds Technologies Limited : 5,87,97,250/- ರವರಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವಹಿವಾಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ

ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಗೆ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ರೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ದಿನಾಂಕ 23.04.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 4,50,01,500/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಮಾಲೀಕತ್ವದ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010145200210 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ V6 Business solutions ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ.ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಲಾದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಮಹರ್ಷಿ ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಓ.ಡಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ನಂ:034124010000007 ರಿಂದ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಮಾಲೀಕ ಉಲ್ಲಾಸ್ ಕೆ.ಗೌಡ ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9945847888 ಎಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊಹಮ್ಮದ್ ತೋಫಿಕ್ ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ: 618, 2ನೇ ಮಹಡಿ, 8ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, ಬಿ.ಜಿ.ಎಸ್. ಗಲ್ಸ್ ಲೇಡೀಸ್ ಹಾಸ್ಟೆಲ್ ಹತ್ತಿರ, ಹಂಪಿನಗರ, ವಿಜಯನಗರ-560104 ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9115526432 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ. ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010145200210 ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.30.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 4,50,01,500/- ಗಳನ್ನು Rohit Jewellers: 1,49,10,000/, Bytech Solution: 1,50,30,000/-, Barcode Enterprises: 1,56,40,000/- Valmiki Nigama: 1,00,00,000/- ರವರಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವಹಿವಾಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮನಿಗೆ ವಹಿವಾಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟಿಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಗೆ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ರೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ದಿನಾಂಕ:06.05.2024 ರಂದು ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಂತೆ ರೂ. 5,10,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಇಟಕಾರಿ ಈತನ ಮಾಲೀಕತ್ವದ ಫಸ್ಟ್ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಖಾತೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: 00015010145200211 ಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರುವ TALENQ SOFTWARE INDIA PVT LTD ಎನ್ನುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ.ರೋಡ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರೆಯಲಾದ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ನಂ:520141001659653 ರಿಂದ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಮಾಲೀಕ ಇರ್ವಾನ್‌ಅನ್ನಾರಿ ಮೊ.ಸಂ.9980422449 ಎಂದಿದ್ದು, ಆರೋಪಿತರು ಸದರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅದೇ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಸೊಹೇಲ್‌ಖಾದರಿ ವಿಳಾಸ ನಂ: 213. 6ನೇ ಮುಖ್ಯರಸ್ತೆ, 1ನೇ ಹಂತ, ಬಿ.ಟಿ.ಎಂ ಲೇಔಟ್,

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-560029. ಮೊ.ಸಂ. 7800600838 ಎಂದು ನಕಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೃಷ್ಟಿಸಿ, ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಫಸ್ಟ್‌ಹೆಲ್ಪ್‌ನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕ್ರೆಡಿಟ್ ಕೋ-ಅಪರೇಟೀವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಯ ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಶಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 00015010145200211 ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಖಾತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ.30.03.2024 ರಂದು ರೂ. 5,10,00,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ನಂತರ ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ M Chandra Mohan: 3,36,90,000/-, Surya Mitra Impex: 1,56,40,000/-, Sipul Enterprises Limited: 34,65,000/-, Valmiki Nigama : 2,00,00,000/-ರವರಿಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದು ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ರವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಮೂಲಕ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಾಲ್ಟೆಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಪಂಗಡದವರಿಗೆ ಮೀಸಲಿಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಠೇವಣಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಗಳಿಸುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆ ಎಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಸದರಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ್‌ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-3 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ಟಕಾರಿ ಮೂಲಕ ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-9 ತೇಜ ತಮಟಂ ಇವರನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ನಕಲಿ ಖಾತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ಹಣವನ್ನು ನಗದೀಕರಿಸಿ, ಹವಾಲ ವಹಿವಾಟಿನ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರದ ಯಶವಂತಪುರದ ಆರೋಪಿ-2 ಕಾಕಿ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸನ ಮನೆಯ ನಂ.ಬಿ-1604, ವೈಷ್ಣವಿ ನಕ್ಷತ್ರ ಅಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್, ಯಶವಂತಪುರ ರೈಲ್ವೇ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಹತ್ತಿರ, ಯಶವಂತಪುರ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-560022, ಅಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ನ ಪಾರ್ಕಿಂಗ್ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಆರೋಪಿ-5 ಪದ್ಮನಾಭ ಈತನಿಗೆ ಆರೋ ಆರೋಪಿ-11 ನಾಗೇಶ್ವರಾವ್ ಈತನಿಗೆ ನಗದು ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಾಂಶದ ಪಾಲು ಹಣವನ್ನು ನೀಡಿ, ಅಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗಿಯಾಗಲು ಒಳ ಸಂಚು ರೂಪಿಸಿ ವಂಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಅಪರಾಧ ವೆಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ಈತನು ವಾಲ್ಟೆಕಿ ನಿಗಮದಿಂದ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಲಾದ ಹಣದಲ್ಲಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 05.03.2024 ರಂದು Zelliant Trading and Consulting Service ನ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಿದ್ಧಿ ಜ್ಯುವೆಲ್ಸ್ ಖಾತೆಗೆ ರೂ. 37,00,011/-, ಮತ್ತು ಅದೇ ದಿನ PIFUMS Management Pvt Ltd ಕಂಪನಿ ಖಾತೆಯಿಂದ ಸಿದ್ಧಿ ಜ್ಯುವೆಲ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ರೂ.39,00,000/- ದಿನಾಂಕ. 07.03.2024 ರಂದು Accord Business Services ಖಾತೆಯಿಂದ ಸಿದ್ಧಿ ರೂ. 80,00,501/- ದಿನಾಂಕ: 07.03.2024 ರಂದು Happiest. Mind technologies Limited ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಿದ್ಧಿ ಜ್ಯುವೆಲ್ಸ್ ಗೆ ರೂ. 77,85,003/- ದಿನಾಂಕ: 07.03.2024 ರಂದು Y M Enterprises ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಿದ್ಧಿ ಜ್ಯುವೆಲ್ಸ್ ಗೆ ರೂ. 30,99,929/- ದಿನಾಂಕ:11.03.2024 ರಂದು Volta Technology Solutions ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಿದ್ಧಿ ಜ್ಯುವೆಲ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ರೂ. 35,00,013/- ದಿನಾಂಕ: 30.03.2024 ರಂದು Sujal Enterprises ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಿದ್ಧಿ ಜ್ಯುವೆಲ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ರೂ. 41,00,007/- ದಿನಾಂಕ: 23.04.2024 ರಂದು V6 Business Solutions CPEAmiನಿಂದ ರೋಹಿತ್ ಜ್ಯುವೆಲ್ಸ್ ಗೆ ರೂ.

1,49,10,000/- ಗಳನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯಾಗಿ ಚಿನ್ನದ ಬಿಸ್ಕತ್ ಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಆರೋಪಿ-2 ಕಾಕಿ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸರಾವ್ ಮತ್ತು ಜ್ಯೋವೆಲರಿ ಅಂಗಡಿಗಳ ಮಾಲೀಕರ ಸಹಕಾರದಿಂದ ಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಸ್ವಂತ ಲಾಭಕೋಸ್ತರ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕರಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮನು ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ರೇವಣಿ ಖಾತೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಅಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹವಾಲ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ಪಡೆದುದಲ್ಲದೆ, ಚಿನ್ನದ ಬಿಸ್ಕತ್‌ಗಳ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಕ್ಕೆ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ವಂಚಿಸುವುದರ ಮೂಲಕ ಅಪರಾಧ ವೆಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ.

ಆರೋಪಿ-1 ಸತ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ವರ್ಮಾ @ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ ಈತನು ತನ್ನ ಪರಿಚಯದ ಆರೋಪಿ-4 ಸಾಯಿದೇಜ ದೇವರಪಲ್ಲಿ ಜೊತೆ ಸಂಚು ರೂಪಿಸಿ. ಆತನಿಗೆ ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ನಕಲಿ ಗುರುತು ಚೇಟಿಯನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ನಕಲಿ ಆಧಾರ್ ಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ತಯಾರಿಸಿ. ಆತನನ್ನು ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯಂತೆ ನಟಿಸುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚಿಸಲು ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-7 ಚಂದ್ರಮೋಹನ್ ಜೊತೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 30.03.2024 ರಂದು ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಎಂ.ಜಿ. ರಸ್ತೆ ಶಾಖೆಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ, ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ಓಪನಿಂಗ್ ಫಾರಂ ಅನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಾನು ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪರಾಧವೆಸಗಲು ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದ ನಕಲಿ ಸೀಲುಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಲ್ಮೀಕಿ ನಿಗಮದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಾಪಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕ ಆರೋಪಿ-5 ಪದ್ಮನಾಭ ಮತ್ತು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಆರೋಪಿ-6 ಪರಶುರಾಮ ದುರ್ಗಣ್ಣನವರುಗಳ ಚೆಕ್ ಹಾಳೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕುವ ಸಹಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೋಲುವಂತೆ ಸಹಿ ಸೀಲುಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿ. ಸದರಿ ಸೀಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿ. ಸದರಿ ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ಗಳಿಂದ ಹಣ ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಮೂಲಕ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಕಾರಣೀಕರ್ತನಾಗುವ ಮೂಲಕ ವಂಚನೆಯ ಅಪರಾಧವೆಸಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ತಾನು ನಗದು ಮತ್ತು ಚಿನ್ನದ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅಕ್ರಮ ಲಾಭ ಗಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಕಲಂ: 120(ಬಿ), 406, 420, 465, 468, 471, ಐಪಿಸಿ ರೀತ್ಯಾ ಅಪರಾಧವೆಸಗಿರುವುದು ತನಿಖೆಯಿಂದ ದೃಢಪಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ.”

A perusal at the summary of the charge sheet narrates vivid details of the alleged offence committed by the petitioner, which makes him the key conspirator. After filing of the charge sheet, the petitioner comes up with a challenge to the arrest on the score that the arrest was illegal on two counts – one non-furnishing of

grounds of arrest and the other not being produced before the jurisdictional Magistrate within 24 hours after taking him into custody.

13. The prayer sought by the petitioner in Writ Petition No.14252 of 2025 is as follows:

"Declare that the arrest of the petitioner dated 11.06.2024 in Crime No.118 of 2024 pending before the XXIII Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge and Special Judge (P.C Act) at Bengaluru is illegal and consequently release the petitioner from the judicial custody, forthwith with a direction to the respondent No.3 to release the petitioner herein and further quash the remand order dated 26-06-2024 as per Annexure-F insofar as petitioner is concerned."

(Emphasis supplied)

The grounds in the petition in support of the aforesaid prayer is as follows:

"42. The Petitioner was arrested on 11.06.2025 and has since been in judicial custody. The investigation has been concluded, and the final charge sheet has been filed on 05.08.2024. Therefore, no further custodial interrogation is required. The Petitioner is ready and willing to comply with any stringent conditions imposed by this Hon'ble Court to ensure his availability for trial. His continued incarceration, despite completion of investigation, amounts to pre trial punishment, which is contrary to the principles of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

43. The Petitioner most humbly submits that as per the investigation record, the entire sum of ₹94.73 Crores, which was allegedly misappropriated from the Karnataka Maharshi Valmiki Scheduled Tribes Development Corporation, has been traced, frozen and recovered from third-party accounts by the Investigating Agency. In view of this development, the principal financial loss alleged against the Petitioners and other accused persons no longer survives, and the purpose of investigation and prosecution stands substantially fulfilled. Hence, continued Incarceration of the Petitioner serves no legal or prosecutorial interest.

44. The Petitioners further submit that all other co-accused persons, including Accused Nos. 3 to 12, who are alleged to have played more direct and operational roles such as presenting forged documents, Impersonating officials, transferring funds, and operating fictitious accounts have already been enlarged on bail by competent courts. The Petitioner, however, remains in custody despite the fact that his alleged role is limited to indirect conspiracy without direct material involvement in execution or misappropriation. In such circumstances, the principle of parity and the right to equality under Article 14 of the Constitution warrant that the Petitioner also be released on bail under similar conditions. Denial of bail to the Petitioner while others stand released would amount to unequal treatment without justification.

45. The petitioner submits that there is a delay in trial thereby violating Article 21 of the constitution of India and in **K.A.Najeeb's** case, considering the fact that the accused were in jail for a period of more than five years and there were 276 witnesses left to be examined, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had refused to Interfere with the order granting bail to the accused by the High Court on the ground of delay in trial and long period of incarceration suffered by the accused. in paragraphs 15, 17 & 18 of the said judgment, it has been observed as under:

"15. This Court has clarified in numerous judgments that the liberty guaranteed by Part III of the Constitution would cover within its protective ambit not only due procedure and fairness but also access to justice and a speedy trial. In Supreme Court Legal Aid Committee

(Representing Undertrial Prisoners) v. Union of India [Supreme Court Legal Aid Committee (Representing Undertrial Prisoners) v. Union of India, (1994) 6 SCC 731, para 15: 1995 SCC (Cri) 39], it was held that undertrials cannot indefinitely be detained pending trial. Ideally, no person ought to suffer adverse consequences of his acts unless the same is established before a neutral arbiter. However, owing to the practicalities of real life where to secure an effective trial and to ameliorate the risk to society in case a potential criminal is left at large pending trial, the courts are tasked with deciding whether an individual ought to be released pending trial or not. Once it is obvious that a timely trial would not be possible and the accused has suffered incarceration for a significant period of time, the courts would ordinarily be obligated to enlarge them on bail.

17. It is thus clear to us that the presence of statutory restrictions like Section 43-D(5) of the UAPA per se does not oust the ability of the constitutional courts to grant bail on grounds of violation of Part III of the Constitution. Indeed, both the restrictions under a statute as well as the powers exercisable under constitutional jurisdiction can be well harmonised. Whereas at commencement of proceedings, the courts are expected to appreciate the legislative policy against grant of bail but the rigours of such provisions will melt down where there is no likelihood of trial being completed within a reasonable time and the period of incarceration already undergone has exceeded a substantial part of the prescribed sentence. Such an approach would safeguard against the possibility of provisions like Section 43-D(5) of the UAPA being used as the sole metric for denial of bail or for wholesale breach of constitutional right to speedy trial.

18. Adverting to the case at hand, we are conscious of the fact that the charges levelled against the respondent are grave and a serious threat to societal harmony. Had it been a case at the threshold, we would have outrightly turned down the respondent's prayer. However, keeping in mind the length of the period spent by him in custody and the unlikelihood of the trial being completed anytime soon, the High Court appears to have been left with no other option except to grant bail. An attempt has been made to strike a balance between the appellant's right to lead evidence of its choice and establish the charges

beyond any doubt and simultaneously the respondent's rights guaranteed under Part III of our Constitution have been well protected."

46. The Apex Court In case of S Muruga Vs state of Andhra Pradesh in Criminal appeal 1250/2022 case where an incident occurred where the assailants entered the office of the Mayor in Chittoor District along with a pistol by wearing mask and trespassed into the Chambers of the Mayor during day time and committed the murder of the Mayor and shot her dead with a point blank range with a pistol. After threatening officials, the assailants escaped from the scene. Charge sheet has already been filed and the trial is going on. The Apex Court held as follows:

"We are troubled by the fact that seven years after the incident the prosecution witnesses have not been examined and the trial is yet to commence. This is completely unacceptable. Time lag creates its own problems in the testimony of the witnesses more so the eye witnesses.

We are however, inclined to grant bail to the appellant considering the role ascribed to the appellant in the charge sheet and the total period spent in custody. Ordered accordingly. This is subject to such conditions that the trial Court may impose. We in addition make it clear that the appellant would be required to be present personally before the trial Court on all dates and would facilitate in the trial. If the trial Court finds that the appellant is endeavouring to delay the trial, or thereafter temper with the evidence, we authorize the trial Court to cancel the bail and put the appellant in custody."

47. The Hon'ble Apex Court in Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs State of Maharashtra & Anr in Criminal Appeal 2787/2024 has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has a right to speedy trial as enshrined under the Constitution of India. It is also further held as follows:

In the recent decision, Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation reported in (2022) 10 SCC 51, prolonged incarceration and inordinate delay engaged the attention of the court, which considered the correct approach towards bail, with respect to several enactments, including Section 37 NDPS Act. The court expressed the opinion that Section 436A (which requires inter alia the accused to be enlarged on bail if the trial

is not concluded within specified periods) of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 would apply: "We do not wish to deal with individual enactments as each special Act has got an objective behind it, followed by the rigour imposed. The general principle governing delay would apply to these categories also. To make it clear, the provision contained in Section 436-A of the Code would apply to the Special Acts also in the absence of any specific provision. For example, the rigour 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 rigour, 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."

Criminals are not born out but made. The human potential in everyone is good and so, never write off any criminal as beyond redemption. This humanist fundamental is often missed when dealing with delinquents, juvenile and adult. Indeed, every saint has a past and every sinner & future. When a crime is committed, a variety of factors is responsible for making the offender commit the crime. Those factors may be social and economic, may be, the result of value erosion or parental neglect, may be, because of the stress of circumstances, or the manifestation of temptations in a milieu of affluence contrasted with indigence or other privations.

If the State or any prosecuting agency including the court concerned has no wherewithal to provide or protect the fundamental right of an accused to have a speedy trial as enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution then the State or any other prosecuting agency should not oppose the plea for bail on the ground that the crime committed is serious. Article 21 of the Constitution applies irrespective of the nature of the crime.

We may hasten to add that the petitioner is still an accused; not a convict. The over-arching postulate of criminal jurisprudence that an accused is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty cannot be brushed aside lightly, howsoever stringent the penal law may be.

Therefore, the prosecution has violated the very fundamental right of the petitioners enshrined in the constitution of India. The Apex Court has also advocated humanistic approach

towards accused and under trials keeping in mind the fact that most of the crimes are products of socio-economic circumstances. The Apex Court ordered accused to be released on bail subject to the terms and conditions which the trial court may deem fit to impose.

48. The petitioner humbly submits that the Apex Court Three Judges in SLP No. 8740/2024 granted bail to the accused who was alleged to have committed GST Input fraud amounting to 1032 crores, the apex court held that the petitioner is in custody for nearly 9 months and thereby bail was granted.

49. The Petitioner humbly submits that in light of the Vihaan Kumar Judgement, the arrest of the Petitioners is more particularly in violation of Article 22(1) & 21 of The Constitution of India. The Fundamental Right of the Petitioners is violated, rendering the arrest as illegal. The Petitioners humbly submits that the Respondent Police have failed to communicate grounds of arrest to the Petitioners. The same is in violation of Vihaan Kumar Judgement, passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in 2025. Therefore, on this ground alone the Petitioners is entitled to be released from Judicial Custody.

50. The Petitioner humbly submits that this Hon'ble Court in the Writ Petition No. 9302/2025, as clearly held that Non-compliance of the Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India i.e. to furnish the Written grounds of arrest to the arrestee is mandatory. Non-compliance of the same vitiates the arrest and any subsequent remand order. Even If the arrest occurred before the Pankaj Bansal and Vihaan 's Case, in other words the judgement of Hon'ble Apex Court is always Retrospective in nature."

On a perusal at the grounds so projected by the petitioner, what would unmistakably emerge is, arrest of the petitioner on 11-06-2024 was illegal, as there was no transit warrant and no grounds of arrest was supplied to the petitioner. It was contended

that the arrest of the petitioner in particular was in violation of Article 22 of the Constitution of India and reliance upon judgment of the Apex Court in the case of Vihaan Kumar was placed.

14. The coordinate Bench, answering the petition, rejects the same by the following order:

- "2. The petitioner being accused No.1 has hatched a conspiracy to knock off the amount which was in the Karnataka Maharshi Valmiki Scheduled Tribes Development Corporation (for short 'Corporation'). As per the averments of the charge sheet, the accused No.1 is stated to have committed misappropriation of funds, by joining hands with others, for a sum of Rs.94,73,08,500/-. Therefore, a case came to be registered against all the accused.
3. The petitioner is before this Court seeking relief on the ground that he was not given the grounds of arrest, which was required to be given as per the findings of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Vihaan Kumar v. State of Haryana and Another.***
4. It is further submitted that the other accused have been released by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court on the ground that Grounds of arrest was not given to the accused. Making such submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner prays to allow the petition.
5. *Per contra*, learned High Court Government Pleader for the State vehemently argued the matter by contending inter alia that the petitioner is standing on a different footing than others. He is the mastermind behind the entire scheme, which would indicate that he hatched a conspiracy with others, to knock off the amount lying in

the Corporation. Moreover, there are several cases pending against the petitioner in respect of similar offences. Therefore, the petition has to be rejected. Making such submissions, learned High Court Government pleader prays to reject the petition.

6. **Having heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and also perused the averments of the complaint and charge sheet, the petitioner is stated to have involved in huge financial fraud at different States. In the earlier round, his bail petition has been rejected by the Co-ordinate bench of this Court on 18.03.2025. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner brought to the notice of this Court that the Grounds of arrest has not been given to the accused, however, at this stage, both the parties have not produced any documents in that regard. Moreover, the petitioner has involved in many such cases. Therefore, the petitioner is not entitled for the relief, as sought for, on that ground.**
7. **In the light of the observation made above, I proceed to pass the following:**

ORDER

The Writ Petition stands dismissed."

(Emphasis supplied)

This order becomes final. A week after rejection of the petition, the petitioner files the subject petition. It now becomes germane to notice the prayer sought in the subject petition. It reads as follows:

- "a **Quash the entire criminal proceedings in Crime No.118/2024 pending on the file of the XXIII Additional City Civil & Sessions Judge and**

Special Judge (P.C.Act), Bengaluru (Annexure-C) arising out of FIR in Crime No.118 of 2024 dated 28-05-2024 (Annexure-A) and the charge sheet dated 5-08-2024 (Annexure-E) filed by the respondent No.1 Police for the alleged offence punishable Under Sections 120B, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 of the IPC and Section 13(1) r/w 13(2) of the PC Act, 1988 as against the petitioner is concerned, and

- b. Declare that the arrest of the petitioner on 11.06.2024 and the remand order dated 13-06-2024 was illegal, arbitrary and violative of Article 19, 21 and 22 of the Constitution of India as illegal and void ab initio in view of the rejection of transit warrant by the Magistrate at Hyderabad on 12-06-2024 and accordingly quash the remand order dated 13.06.2024 passed in Crime No.118 of 2024 by the learned III ACMM, Bengaluru as per (Annexure C & D) insofar as the petitioner is concerned.**
- c. Declare that the arrest of the petitioner dated 11.06.2024 in Crime No.118 of 2024 pending before the XXIII Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge and Special Judge (P.C.Act) at Bengaluru (Annexure-C) is illegal and consequently release the petitioner from judicial custody, forthwith with a direction to the respondent No.3 to release the petitioner herein."**

(Emphasis added)

Prayer (b) is to declare arrest of the petitioner being violative of Article 22 of the Constitution of India in view of rejection of transit warrant. Prayer (c) is to hold the arrest of the petitioner as illegal and consequently release him. Prayer (a) for the first time, springs

seeking quashment of entire proceedings in Crime No.118 of 2024 and the charge sheet so filed thereon.

15. The issue now would be, whether the petitioner is entitled to repeatedly challenge the alleged illegal arrest on new grounds that were available at the time when he had filed the earlier petition. It is an admitted fact that the present petition, second in line, is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the CrPC which was the same provision that was invoked when filing the earlier petition. Jurisprudence is replete by the Apex Court considering the issue, as to whether the second petition seeking the very same prayer, would become maintainable or otherwise, particularly on pleas manifestly available at the first instance.

16. The learned senior counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon judgment of the Apex Court in the case of **ANIL**

KHADKIWALA v. STATE (GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI)¹

wherein the Apex Court considering the issue has held as follows:

"....

8. In *Mohan Singh* [Supt. and Remembrancer of Legal Affairs v. *Mohan Singh*, (1975) 3 SCC 706: 1975 SCC (Cri) 156: AIR 1975 SC 1002], it was held that a successive application under Section 482 CrPC under changed circumstances was maintainable and the dismissal of the earlier application was no bar to the same, observing: (SCC pp. 709-10, para 2)

"2. ... Here, the situation is wholly different. The earlier application which was rejected by the High Court was an application under Section 561-A of the Criminal Procedure Code to quash the proceeding and the High Court rejected it on the ground that the evidence was yet to be led and it was not desirable to interfere with the proceeding at that stage. But, thereafter, the criminal case dragged on for a period of about one-and-a-half years without any progress at all and it was in these circumstances that Respondents 1 and 2 were constrained to make a fresh application to the High Court under Section 561-A to quash the proceeding. It is difficult to see how in these circumstances, it could ever be contended that what the High Court was being asked to do by making the subsequent application was to review or revise the order made by it on the earlier application. Section 561-A preserves the inherent power of the High Court to make such orders as it deems fit to prevent abuse of the process of the court or to secure the ends of justice and the High Court must, therefore, exercise its inherent powers having regard to the situation prevailing at the particular point of time when its inherent jurisdiction is sought to be invoked. The High Court was in the circumstances entitled to entertain the subsequent application of Respondents 1 and 2 and consider whether on the

¹ (2019) 17 SCC 294

facts and circumstances then obtaining the continuance of the proceeding against the respondents constituted an abuse of the process of the Court or its quashing was necessary to secure the ends of justice. The facts and circumstances obtaining at the time of the subsequent application of Respondents 1 and 2 were clearly different from what they were at the time of the earlier application of the first respondent because, despite the rejection of the earlier application of the first respondent, the prosecution had failed to make any progress in the criminal case even though it was filed as far back as 1965 and the criminal case rested where it was for a period of over one-and-a-half years."

9. In *Harshendra Kumar D. v. RebatilataKoley* [*Harshendra Kumar D. v. RebatilataKoley*, (2011) 3 SCC 351; (2011) 1 SCC (Civ) 717; (2011) 1 SCC (Cri) 1139; 2011 Cri LJ 1626], this Court held: (SCC p. 362, paras 26-27)

"26. Criminal prosecution is a serious matter; it affects the liberty of a person. No greater damage can be done to the reputation of a person than dragging him in a criminal case. In our opinion, the High Court fell into grave error in not taking into consideration the uncontroverted documents relating to the appellant's resignation from the post of Director of the Company. Had these documents been considered by the High Court, it would have been apparent that the appellant has resigned much before the cheques were issued by the Company.

27. As noticed above, the appellant resigned from the post of Director on 2-3-2004. The dishonoured cheques were issued by the Company on 30-4-2004 i.e. much after the appellant had resigned from the post of Director of the Company. The acceptance of the appellant's resignation is duly reflected in the Resolution dated 2-3-2004. Then in the prescribed form (Form 32), the Company informed to the Registrar of Companies on 4-3-2004 about the appellant's resignation. It is not even the case of the complainants that the dishonoured cheques were issued by the appellant. These facts leave no manner of doubt that on the date the offence was

committed by the Company, the appellant was not the Director; he had nothing to do with the affairs of the Company. In this view of the matter, if the criminal complaints are allowed to proceed against the appellant, it would result in gross injustice to the appellant and tantamount to an abuse of process of the court."

10. Atul Shukla [*Atul Shukla v. State of M.P.*, (2019) 17 SCC 299] is clearly distinguishable on its facts as the relief sought was for review/recall/modify the earlier order [*Surendra Singh v. State of M.P.*, 2018 SCC OnLine MP 1425] of dismissal in the interest of justice. **Consequently, the earlier order of dismissal was recalled. It was in that circumstance, it was held that in view of Section 362 CrPC the earlier order passed dismissing the quashing application could not have been recalled. The case is completely distinguishable on its own facts.**

11. The Company, of which the appellant was a Director, is a party-respondent in the complaint. The interests of the complainant are therefore adequately protected. In the entirety of the facts and circumstances of the case, we are unable to hold that the second application for quashing of the complaint was not maintainable merely because of the dismissal of the earlier application."

(Emphasis supplied)

A second petition was held to be maintainable on different grounds. The said judgment is distinguishable without much *ado*, as the petition preferred by the petitioner which comes to be rejected by the coordinate Bench has no difference with the subject petition. There is no iota of change of circumstance for the petitioner to be permitted to file second petition. The second petition is admittedly preferred adding a ground with regard to his arrest being illegal

from 11-06-2024 till he was remanded to police custody under the jurisdiction of Bengaluru, all on the score that the transit warrant was returned. This is a ground that was available to the petitioner at the time when he had filed the earlier petition. What was projected in the earlier petition, though filed under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. was on grounds of arrest. That fails.

17. The second petition is preferred on an altogether new ground that his arrest was illegal, as transit warrant had been returned. As observed earlier, the petition was preferred on 12-05-2025. The arrest of the petitioner was on 11-06-2024. By the time the earlier petition was filed, charge sheet also had been filed. **Therefore, this was a ground that was available to be taken and contended in the earlier petition. Since the said ground was not taken though available, it had been abandoned and the abandoned ground is exhumed in the subject petition. The petitioner now, by the present petition, is in effect wanting to resurrect substantially the same grounds interlaced with a plea for quashment of proceedings. This is clearly impermissible in law.** Even in the criminal proceedings,

i.e., in the petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., the principle that a ground that was available to be taken at the outset not being taken cannot be permitted to be taken in a second petition, **becomes applicable, as fragmented petitions would emerge on given up grounds. It can lead to several petitions being filed on each of the grounds that the petitioner would think of, after the dismissal of the petition, till he succeeds in one of the petitions. This is *sans* countenance.**

18. It becomes apposite to refer to the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of **BHISHAM LAL VERMA v. STATE OF U.P.**² wherein the Apex Court has held as follows:

“.....

11. We are in complete agreement with these observations of the Madras High Court. Though it is clear that there can be no blanket rule that a second petition under Section 482 Cr. P.C. would not lie in any situation and it would depend upon the facts and circumstances of the individual case, it is not open to a person aggrieved to raise one plea after the other, by invoking the jurisdiction of the High Court under Section 482 Cr. P.C., though all such pleas were very much available even at the first instance. Permitting

² 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1399

the filing of successive petitions under Section 482 Cr. P.C. ignoring this principle would enable an ingenious accused to effectively stall the proceedings against him to suit his own interest and convenience, by filing one petition after another under Section 482 Cr. P.C., irrespective of when the cause therefor arose. Such abuse of process cannot be permitted."

(Emphasis supplied)

The said judgment is again followed in **M.C. RAVIKUMAR v. D.S. VELMURUGAN**³ wherein the Apex Court has held as follows:

"...

Discussion and Analysis:—

10. We have heard the submissions advanced at the bar and have gone through the impugned order and material placed on record.

11. The short question that arises for our consideration is "Whether a second quashing petition under Section 482 CrPC would be maintainable on the grounds/pleas that were available to be raised even at the time of filing/decision of the first quashing petition?"

12. At the outset, we may like to note that the submission advanced by the learned counsel for the accused-respondents that the second quashing petition came to be filed based on new grounds/pleas, is not tenable on the face of it. From the bare perusal of the record, it is evident that the second quashing petition raised no such grounds/pleas which were unavailable to the accused-respondents at the time of adjudication of the first quashing petition. The failure of the accused-respondents to raise a pertinent ground/plea which was tangibly available to them at the time of adjudication of the first quashing petition can in no circumstance grant a right to the said accused persons to file

³ 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1498

a subsequent quashing petition as it would amount to seeking review on pre-existing material.

13. This Court in catena of judgments has held that it is not open to an accused person to raise one plea after the other, by repeatedly invoking the inherent jurisdiction of the High Court under Section 482 CrPC, though all such pleas were very much available to him even at the first instance. We may hasten to add that there is no sweeping rule to the effect that a second quashing petition under Section 482 CrPC is not maintainable and its maintainability will depend on the facts and circumstances of each case. However, the onus to show that there arose a change in circumstances warranting entertainment of a subsequent quashing petition would be on the person filing the said petition. In this regard, we may gainfully refer to the observations made by this Court in the case of *Bhisham Lal Verma v. State of UP*, which are extracted below for ready reference:—

"11. Though it is clear that there can be no blanket rule that a second petition under Section 482 Cr. P.C. would not lie in any situation and it would depend upon the facts and circumstances of the individual case, it is not open to a person aggrieved to raise one plea after the other, by invoking the jurisdiction of the High Court under Section 482 Cr. P.C., though all such pleas were very much available even at the first instance. Permitting the filing of successive petitions under Section 482 Cr. P.C. ignoring this principle would enable an ingenious accused to effectively stall the proceedings against him to suit his own interest and convenience, by filing one petition after another under Section 482 Cr. P.C., irrespective of when the cause therefor arose. Such abuse of process cannot be permitted."

(Emphasis Supplied)

14. Furthermore, we are of the opinion that the order passed by the High Court in the second quashing

petition amounted to review (plain and simple) of the earlier order passed by the co-ordinate bench of the High Court in the first quashing petition, since there was admittedly no change in circumstances and no new grounds/pleas became available to the accused-respondents, after passing of the order of dismissal in the first quashing petition. The order passed by the High Court is in gross disregard to all tenets of law as Section 362 CrPC expressly bars review of a judgment or final order disposing of a case except to correct some clerical or arithmetical error.

15. This Court has time and again held that the High Courts while exercising their inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC cannot override a specific bar laid down by other provisions of CrPC, i.e., to say that the High Court is not empowered to review its own decision under the purported exercise of its inherent powers. To fortify the aforesaid conclusion, we may gainfully refer to the observations made by this Court in the case of *Simrikhia v. Dolley Mukherjee and Chhabi Mukherjee*¹⁹, the relevant portions whereof are quoted below for ease of reference:

"6. In *Superintendent & Remembrancer of Legal Affairs v. Mohan Singh*, (1975) 3 SCC 706, this Court held that Section 561A preserves the inherent power of the High Court to make such orders as it deems fit to prevent abuse of the process of the Court or to secure the ends of justice and the High Court must therefore exercise its inherent powers having regard to the situation prevailing at the particular point of time when its inherent jurisdiction is sought to be invoked. In that case the facts and circumstances obtaining at the time of the subsequent application were clearly different from what they were at the time of the earlier application. The question as to the scope and ambit of the inherent power of the High Court vis-a-vis an earlier order made by it was, therefore, not concluded by this decision.

7. The inherent jurisdiction of the High Court cannot be invoked to override bar of review u/s 362. It is clearly stated in Sooraj Devi v. Pyare Lal, (1981) 1 SCC 500 that the inherent power of

the Court cannot be exercised for doing that which is specifically prohibited by the Code. The law is therefore clear that the inherent power cannot be exercised for doing that which cannot be done on account of the bar under other provisions of the Code. The court is not empowered to review its own decision under the purported exercise of inherent power. We find that the impugned order in this case is in effect one reviewing the earlier order on a reconsideration of the same materials. The High Court has grievously erred in doing so. Even on merits, we do not find any compelling reasons to quash the proceedings at that stage.”

(Emphasis supplied)

16. In the instant case, the quashing by the High Court of a similar complaint, i.e., Criminal Complaint No. 41 of 2015 filed by the complainant against the accused-respondents in respect of properties situated at Thanjavur *vide* order dated 9th March, 2020 was an event that happened well before the dismissal of the first quashing petition under Section 482 CrPC and the said ground/plea was manifestly available to the accused-respondents while seeking adjudication of the first quashing petition. That being the situation, the accused-respondents were not at liberty to invoke the inherent jurisdiction of the High Court raising the aforesaid ground/plea at a later point of time by filing the second quashing petition.

17. As an upshot of the above discussion, we have no hesitation in holding that the impugned order passed by the High Court is unjustified on the face of the record and cannot be affirmed. Hence, the impugned order dated 13th September, 2022 passed by the High Court in Criminal Original Petition No. 16241 of 2022 is quashed and set aside. As a result, thereof, the Criminal Complaint No. 1828 of 2019 filed by the appellant-complainant against the accused-respondents is restored to the file of the learned IX Metropolitan Judicial Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai.”

(Emphasis supplied)

The Apex Court, in the afore-quoted elucidation of law, both in **BHISAM LAL VERMA** and **RAVIKUMAR** makes it abundantly clear that successive petitions under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., grounded upon pleas manifestly available at the first instance, are impermissible. **To permit otherwise, would be putting a premium on fragmented litigation, and reducing the judicial process into a stratagem for delay.** That being the situation, the accused was not at liberty to invoke the inherent jurisdiction, raising the ground/plea at a later point in time, by filing second petition.

19. The learned senior counsel for the petitioner seeks to contend that prayer for quashing the proceedings was not sought earlier; what was preferred was only to declare the arrest of the petitioner as illegal and his consequent release. Therefore, in effect, this is the first quashing petition that is preferred. This submission borders on hyper technicality. Two of the grounds now urged were manifestly available earlier – one ground is raised, the petition is lost. The second ground is raised in the second petition. Therefore, I decline to accept the submission of the learned senior counsel that

the second ground can be urged in the second petition, taking shelter under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. Therefore, the ground, on grounds of arrest and release on illegal arrest cannot be permitted to be agitated in the subject petition. In the light of the preceding analysis, I decline to entertain the subject petition, second in line, *albeit*, laced with a challenge to the entire proceedings under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C./528 of the BNSS. Issue No.1 is answered accordingly.

Issue No.2:

(ii) If maintainable, whether the arrest of the petitioner could be held to be illegal, resulting in his release from custody?

20. The second issue that has fallen for consideration with regard to the arrest being illegal or otherwise, would be dependent upon the first issue. If the first issue was in favour of the petitioner, further examination would ensue. In the light of the issue No.1 being held against the petitioner, consideration of the issue No.2 is unwarranted, as, if the petition is not even

entertainable on the said issue, consideration of the issue would not arise. Therefore, issue No.2 is answered accordingly.

CHALLENGE TO THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS IN CRIME NO.118 OF 2024 AND ITS AFTERMATH:

Issue No.3:

(iii) Whether interference in exercise of jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS (482 of the Cr.P.C.) is warranted?

21. What remains is, consideration of quashment of proceedings under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. The complaint is quoted hereinabove. The petitioner is said to be key conspirator of huge scam running to ₹188/- crores. Cash of ₹8/- crores and gold of 15 Kgs. is found in the house of the petitioner who is said to be a civil contractor. The explanation of cash and gold found, has not come forward at all. Even if it has come forward, it has to be tested in evidence. The modus operandi of the petitioner is narrated in the summary of the charge sheet, as quoted hereinabove, insofar it

concerns the petitioner. **The charge sheet paints the petitioner not as a passive bystander, but as the very kingpin of the fraudulent design. The wealth of detail in the investigation, recovery of cash and gold and the labyrinth of transactions alleged are all matters demanding the crucible of full blown trial.** The case is shrouded with maze of facts. The money that had to be spent for upliftment of Scheduled Tribes, the avowed objective with which the Corporation was created, is allegedly swindled by the officers of the Bank, or the accused named in the charge sheet.

22. The learned Additional Special Public Prosecutor has brought to the notice of this Court that the CBI is also conducting investigation on the alleged scam, as officers of the Bank, a Government of India undertaking are accused. It, therefore, **revolves round maze of facts which would amaze this Court for interference under Section 528 of the BNSS.** If interfered, it would run foul of the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of

KAPTAN SINGH v. STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH⁴ wherein it is

held as follows:

"9.1. At the outset, it is required to be noted that in the present case the High Court in exercise of powers under Section 482 CrPC has quashed the criminal proceedings for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 149, 406, 329 and 386 IPC. It is required to be noted that when the High Court in exercise of powers under Section 482 CrPC quashed the criminal proceedings, by the time the investigating officer after recording the statement of the witnesses, statement of the complainant and collecting the evidence from the incident place and after taking statement of the independent witnesses and even statement of the accused persons, has filed the charge-sheet before the learned Magistrate for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 149, 406, 329 and 386 IPC and even the learned Magistrate also took the cognizance. From the impugned judgment and order [Radhey Shyam Gupta v. State of U.P., 2020 SCC OnLine All 914] passed by the High Court, it does not appear that the High Court took into consideration the material collected during the investigation/inquiry and even the statements recorded. **If the petition under Section 482 CrPC was at the stage of FIR in that case the allegations in the FIR/complaint only are required to be considered and whether a cognizable offence is disclosed or not is required to be considered. However, thereafter when the statements are recorded, evidence is collected and the charge-sheet is filed after conclusion of the investigation/inquiry the matter stands on different footing and the Court is required to consider the material/evidence collected during the investigation.** Even at this stage also, as observed and held by this Court in a catena of decisions, the High Court is not required to go into the merits of the allegations and/or enter into the merits of the case as if the High Court is exercising the appellate jurisdiction and/or conducting the trial. As held by this Court in Dineshbhai Chandubhai Patel [Dineshbhai Chandubhai

⁴(2021) 9 SCC 35

Patel v. State of Gujarat, (2018) 3 SCC 104 : (2018) 1 SCC (Cri) 683] in order to examine as to whether factual contents of FIR disclose any cognizable offence or not, the High Court cannot act like the investigating agency nor can exercise the powers like an appellate court. It is further observed and held that that question is required to be examined keeping in view, the contents of FIR and prima facie material, if any, requiring no proof. **At such stage, the High Court cannot appreciate evidence nor can it draw its own inferences from contents of FIR and material relied on. It is further observed it is more so, when the material relied on is disputed. It is further observed that in such a situation, it becomes the job of the investigating authority at such stage to probe and then of the court to examine questions once the charge-sheet is filed along with such material as to how far and to what extent reliance can be placed on such material.**

9.2. In Dhruvaram Murlidhar Sonar [Dhruvaram Murlidhar Sonar v. State of Maharashtra, (2019) 18 SCC 191 : (2020) 3 SCC (Cri) 672] after considering the decisions of this Court in Bhajan Lal [State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335 : 1992 SCC (Cri) 426] , it is held by this Court that exercise of powers under Section 482 CrPC to quash the proceedings is an exception and not a rule. **It is further observed that inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC though wide is to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution, only when such exercise is justified by tests specifically laid down in the section itself. It is further observed that appreciation of evidence is not permissible at the stage of quashing of proceedings in exercise of powers under Section 482 CrPC.** Similar view has been expressed by this Court in Arvind Khanna [CBI v. Arvind Khanna, (2019) 10 SCC 686 : (2020) 1 SCC (Cri) 94] , Managipet [State of Telangana v. Managipet, (2019) 19 SCC 87 : (2020) 3 SCC (Cri) 702] and in XYZ [XYZ v. State of Gujarat, (2019) 10 SCC 337 : (2020) 1 SCC (Cri) 173] , referred to hereinabove.

9.3. Applying the law laid down by this Court in the aforesaid decisions to the facts of the case on hand, we are of the opinion that the High Court has exceeded its jurisdiction in

quashing the criminal proceedings in exercise of powers under Section 482 CrPC.

10. The High Court has failed to appreciate and consider the fact that there are very serious triable issues/allegations which are required to be gone into and considered at the time of trial. The High Court has lost sight of crucial aspects which have emerged during the course of the investigation. The High Court has failed to appreciate and consider the fact that the document i.e. a joint notarised affidavit of Mamta Gupta Accused 2 and Munni Devi under which according to Accused 2 Ms Mamta Gupta, Rs 25 lakhs was paid and the possession was transferred to her itself is seriously disputed. It is required to be noted that in the registered agreement to sell dated 27-10-2010, the sale consideration is stated to be Rs 25 lakhs and with no reference to payment of Rs 25 lakhs to Ms Munni Devi and no reference to handing over the possession. However, in the joint notarised affidavit of the same date i.e. 27-10-2010 sale consideration is stated to be Rs 35 lakhs out of which Rs 25 lakhs is alleged to have been paid and there is a reference to transfer of possession to Accused 2. Whether Rs 25 lakhs has been paid or not the accused have to establish during the trial, because the accused are relying upon the said document and payment of Rs 25 lakhs as mentioned in the joint notarised affidavit dated 27-10-2010. It is also required to be considered that the first agreement to sell in which Rs 25 lakhs is stated to be sale consideration and there is reference to the payment of Rs 10 lakhs by cheques. It is a registered document. The aforesaid are all triable issues/allegations which are required to be considered at the time of trial. The High Court has failed to notice and/or consider the material collected during the investigation.

11. Now so far as the finding recorded by the High Court that no case is made out for the offence under Section 406 IPC is concerned, it is to be noted that the High Court itself has noted that the joint notarised affidavit dated 27-10-2010 is seriously disputed, however as per the High Court the same is required to be considered in the civil proceedings. There the High Court has committed an error. Even the High Court has failed to notice that another FIR has been lodged against the accused for the offences under Sections 467, 468, 471 IPC

with respect to the said alleged joint notarised affidavit. Even according to the accused the possession was handed over to them. However, when the payment of Rs 25 lakhs as mentioned in the joint notarised affidavit is seriously disputed and even one of the cheques out of 5 cheques each of Rs 2 lakhs was dishonoured and according to the accused they were handed over the possession (which is seriously disputed) it can be said to be entrustment of property. Therefore, at this stage to opine that no case is made out for the offence under Section 406 IPC is premature and the aforesaid aspect is to be considered during trial. It is also required to be noted that the first suit was filed by Munni Devi and thereafter subsequent suit came to be filed by the accused and that too for permanent injunction only. Nothing is on record that any suit for specific performance has been filed. Be that as it may, all the aforesaid aspects are required to be considered at the time of trial only.

12. Therefore, the High Court has grossly erred in quashing the criminal proceedings by entering into the merits of the allegations as if the High Court was exercising the appellate jurisdiction and/or conducting the trial. The High Court has exceeded its jurisdiction in quashing the criminal proceedings in exercise of powers under Section 482 CrPC.

13. Even the High Court has erred in observing that original complaint has no locus. The aforesaid observation is made on the premise that the complainant has not placed on record the power of attorney along with the counter filed before the High Court. However, when it is specifically stated in the FIR that Munni Devi has executed the power of attorney and thereafter the investigating officer has conducted the investigation and has recorded the statement of the complainant, accused and the independent witnesses, thereafter whether the complainant is having the power of attorney or not is to be considered during trial.

14. In view of the above and for the reasons stated above, the impugned judgment and order [Radhey Shyam Gupta v. State of U.P., 2020 SCC OnLine All 914] passed by the High Court quashing the criminal proceedings in exercise

of powers under Section 482 CrPC is unsustainable and the same deserves to be quashed and set aside and is accordingly quashed and set aside. Now, the trial is to be conducted and proceeded further in accordance with law and on its own merits. It is made clear that the observations made by this Court in the present proceedings are to be treated to be confined to the proceedings under Section 482 CrPC only and the trial court to decide the case in accordance with law and on its own merits and on the basis of the evidence to be laid and without being influenced by any of the observations made by us hereinabove. The present appeal is accordingly allowed."

(Emphasis supplied)"

The principle enunciated in KAPTAN SINGH as observed is apposite: quashing of proceedings post charge sheet is an exception not a rule and can be invoked only where the allegations taken, on their face value, disclose no offence whatsoever. This is far from the case here. For the aforesaid reasons, the prayer with regard to quashment of proceedings under Section 482 of the CrPC is to be rejected. Issue No.3 is answered accordingly.

CONCLUSION:

From the above discussion, the **following inexorable conclusions emerge:**

- (i) The second petition under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C./528 of BNSS is neither maintainable nor**

entertainable, unless founded upon demonstrable change in circumstance.

(ii) Grounds that were manifestly available at the time of first petition, cannot be exhumed later, to prop up a second petition.

(iii) In the light of the grave allegations, voluminous material and triable questions of fact, this Court cannot wield its extraordinary jurisdiction to stifle proceedings at their threshold.

In the result and for the reasons elaborated hereinabove, **this Court finds no scintilla of merit in the present petition. Law cannot bend to repeated challenges, devoid of new substance nor it can ignore the gravity of allegations that undoubtedly wants an adjudication in a full blown trial.**

23. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands ***dismissed***.

**Sd/-
(M.NAGAPRASANNA)
JUDGE**

Bkp
CT:SS