



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NOS. OF 2026
(@SLP(CRL.) NOS.16470-16471 OF 2025)

PINKY RANI ETC APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

1. Heard.

2. Leave granted.

3. Appellants have been arraigned as an accused in the FIR No. 350 of 2024 registered registered by Rabale MIDC Police Station, New Mumbai for the offences punishable under Sections 318 (4) read with 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) and Sections 3, 6 and 4 of Indian Wireless Act, 1933 and Sections 20, 20A, 21 and 25 of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 alleging that between April and July 2024 the Department of Telecommunications (DoT) received complaints from people that some international

calls were showing up in their mobile phones as regular Indian local calls and on an investigation, it was found that these calls were illegally routed using special internet phone lines called SIP and made to look like local calls inside India though it was parted from a different country.

4. It is further alleged that M/s. Humanity Path Private Limited though its legal lines operating from other countries called M/s. Web Werks in Mumbai and M/s. Srivansh Consulting Private Limited for running technical setup for these calls by using 1000 phone numbers and was found running the infrastructure. It was alleged that internet and hosting services were provided by M/s. Web Werks.

5. During the course of investigation, the place belonging to the appellant was inspected and confirmed that this illegal calls routing called 'grey routing' was happening to a network and seized the equipments like routers, servers that proved unauthorized use of VOIP (internet calls). It is alleged that such illegal use of the facilities had resulted

in financial loss of more than Rs.5 crores to the exchequer.

6. The appellants who are the Directors of M/s. Srivansh Consulting Private Limited are accused of being responsible for setting up this illegal use of servers and management of the infrastructure use for such illegal routing of the calls.

7. By the impugned order, both the trial court and the High Court have rejected the prayer for bail on the ground of *prima facie* case and it was necessary that appellants should be interrogated in custody.

8. While issuing notice, this Court had granted interim protection to the appellants subject to the condition that they would cooperate with the investigation. Pursuant the same the Investigating Officer (IO) is said to have summoned the appellants and accordingly they have appeared and furnished their statements. This fact is not disputed by the learned counsel for the respondent-State.

9. However, the learned counsel for the respondent-State would vehemently contend that in order to unearth the larger conspiracy and the misuse of internet facility, the custodial interrogation of the appellants was warranted. However, we are not inclined to accept the said submission for the simple reason that pursuant to the interim protection granted by this Court, the appellants have appeared before the IO, cooperated with the investigation and have tendered their statement. Nothing further has been placed on record to demonstrate that any fresh material has been elicited or unearthed after such recording of the statement of appellants which are serious enough to deny the bail.

10. Hence, we are of the considered view that interim protection granted earlier deserves to be made absolute. Accordingly, it is made absolute and it is explicitly made clear that in the event of the presence of the appellants being warranted for the purpose of the investigation, they shall appear as and when called upon by the IO, without

fail, and in the event of their non-cooperation with the IO, the respondent-State would be at liberty to move the jurisdictional trial court for cancellation of bail. In the event of such an application being filed, the trial court shall afford an opportunity to the appellants herein and pass orders on its own merits.

11. Accordingly the appeals stand disposed of and appellants are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail by IO on such terms and conditions as he deems fit. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.
(ARAVIND KUMAR)

.....J.
(PRASANNA B. VARALE)

New Delhi;
January 12, 2026.

ITEM NO.23

COURT NO.15

SECTION II-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s).
16470-16471/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 25-07-2025 in ABA No. 2059/2025 25-07-2025 in ABA No. 2061/2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay]

PINKY RANI ETC

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA

Respondent(s)

IA No. 262756/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE
IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 262758/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

Date : 12-01-2026 This matter was called on for hearing
today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARAVIND KUMAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASANNA B. VARALE

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Rahul Shyam Bhandari, AOR
Ms. G. Priyadarshni, Adv.
Mr. Satyam Pathak, Adv.
Ms. Anshita Sharma, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Raman Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Dharmadhikari, Adv.
Mr. Aaditya Aniruddha Pande, AOR
Mr. Shrirang B. Varma, Adv.

**UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R**

- 1. Leave granted.**
- 2. Appeals are disposed of in terms of the Signed Order placed on the file.**
- 3. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.**

**(RASHI GUPTA)
COURT MASTER (SH)**

**(AVGV RAMU)
COURT MASTER (NSH)**