

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION (CRIMINAL) DIARY NO(S). 41443/2023

RAGHU RAMAKRISHNA RAJU

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

The petitioner is currently a Member of the Legislative Assembly ("MLA") from the Telugu Desam Party in the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly, representing the Undi constituency, and serving as the Deputy Speaker. Respondent No.2 is an MLA representing the Kadapa constituency, the founder of the Yuva Jana Sramika Rythu Congress Party, and the former Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh. He is also the son of the late Y.S. Rajasekhara Reddy, who served as the Chief Minister of the erstwhile united Andhra Pradesh from 2004 to 2009. Respondents No.2 to 14 are accused in Chargesheet C.C.No.8 of 2012, filed by Respondent No.1 –the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) before the Special Judge for CBI Cases, Hyderabad.

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that during the tenure of the late Y.S. Rajasekhara Reddy as Chief Minister, allegations were made that the State Government had extended undue benefits to certain

corporations and individuals based on a *quid pro quo* arrangement. These benefits allegedly included the allotment of land, mineral rights, licenses, benefits within Special Economic Zones (SEZs), and rights to develop ports along the eastern coastline of Andhra Pradesh, in addition to permissions for setting up of star hotels and commercial complexes in Hyderabad and other major cities. In return, the beneficiaries were purportedly supposed to invest kickbacks into various personal and corporate businesses linked to Respondent No.2.

3. By an order dated 10.08.2011, the High Court of Andhra Pradesh directed Respondent No.1-CBI to investigate these allegations. Pursuant to this order, Respondent No.1 registered a case bearing R.C.No.19(A)/2011-CBI, Hyderabad under Sections 120B, 420, 409, and 477-A of the Indian Penal Code read with Sections 13(2), 13(1)(c), and 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, against Respondent No.2 and 73 others. Thereafter, Respondent No.1 filed Chargesheet C.C. No.8 of 2012 before the Special Judge for CBI Cases, Hyderabad, on 31.01.2012 naming respondents 2 to 14 as accused persons. Additionally, Respondent No.1 subsequently filed 10 more

chargesheets against the respondents and other accused persons.

4. The petitioner alleges that these criminal cases have been pending trial before the Special Judge for CBI Cases, Hyderabad for over ten years with no significant progress due to extraneous reasons. It is contended that the respondents are deliberately delaying the proceedings on multiple pretexts. Hence, the petitioner has filed the present Transfer Petition seeking the following reliefs:

“(a) Transfer C.C.Nos.8 of 2012 pending before the Ld. Special Judge for CBI Cases, Hyderabad to a court of equal and competent jurisdiction in any other state, inter-alia the Ld.Principal District Judge, Patiala House Court, New Delhi;

b) Pass such other and/or further order(s) that this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.”

5. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned senior counsel appearing for the respondent Nos.1 to 14 and perused the material on record.

6. During the course of submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner has drawn our attention to the fact that despite several orders being passed by the High Court for the State of Telangana including the one dated 23.07.2024, there has been hardly any progress in

the prosecution of the matters before the concerned CBI Court. In this regard, the order dated 23.07.2024 passed in WP (PIL) No.77 of 2023 and *Suo motu* W.P.No.11 of 2023 by the High Court for the State of Telangana has been read to us.

7. On perusal of the said order, we find that the High Court is monitoring the progress of the case before the concerned CBI Court. The High Court has recorded that the CBI Court shall take up the cases pending against the respondent No.3 therein on a day to day basis and it has reiterated the said directions.

8. Even though the High Court has opined as above, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that one of the reasons for seeking transfer of the case is owing to the delay in the prosecution and conclusion of the trial before the CBI Court.

9. We do not think that the transfer of the case as sought for by the petitioner herein would any way aid in an expeditious disposal of the case.

10. In the circumstances, we do not think that this petition would call for any further consideration.

11. Hence, the Transfer Petition is dismissed. Needless to observe that the directions of the High Court shall be complied with by the concerned CBI

Court.

12. In view of the aforesaid order, all pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

....., J
(B.V. NAGARATHNA)

....., J
(SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA)

NEW DELHI
JANUARY 27, 2025

ITEM NO.1

COURT NO.8

SECTION II

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

TRANSFER PETITION (CRIMINAL) DIARY NO(S). 41443/2023

RAGHU RAMAKRISHNA RAJU

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

(IA NO. 107143/2024 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS

IA NO. 228241/2023 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURESIA NO. 165495/2024 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA NO. 220815/2023 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..)

WITH

SLP(CRL) NO. 15309-15310/2023 (II)

(IA FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES ON
IA 234282/2023IA NO. 234282/2023 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

Date : 27-01-2025 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE B.V. NAGARATHNA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA

For Petitioner(s): Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, AOR
Mr. Rohan Dewan, Adv.
Ms. Harsha Tripathi, Adv.
Mr. Vishwaditya Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Siddani Sri Venkatesh, Adv.

For Respondent(s): Mr. Suryaprakash V Raju, A.S.G.
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR
Mr. Annam Venkatesh, Adv.
Mr. Zoheb Hussain, Adv.
Mr. Kanu Agarwal, Adv.

Mr. Rajat Nair, Adv.
Mr. Rajendra Singh Rana, Adv.

Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Goel, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ashutosh Ghade, AOR
Mr. Adithya Koshy Roy, Adv.
Ms. Siddhi Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Naveen Goel, Adv.

Mr. Amit Agrawal, AOR

Mr. Mayank Jain, Adv.
Mr. Parmatma Singh, AOR
Mr. Madhur Jain, Adv.
Ms. Aakriti Dhawan, Adv.
Mr. Arpit Goel, Adv.
Mr. Reshul Mittra, Adv.

Mr. Krishna Kumar Singh, AOR

Mr. Ranjit Kumar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ved P Singh, Adv.
Mr. Kushagra Pandey, AOR

Mr. S.Niranjan Reddy, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Amit Agrawal, AOR
Mr. Sahil Raveen, Adv.
Mr. Sana Jain, Adv.

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

The Transfer Petition is dismissed in terms of
the signed order.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand
disposed of.

SLP(CRL) NOS. 15309-15310/2023

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that
he has instructions to withdraw these Special Leave

Petitions.

His submission is placed on record.

**The Special Leave Petitions are dismissed as
withdrawn.**

**Pending application(s), if any, shall stand
disposed of.**

**(B. LAKSHMI MANIKYA VALLI)
COURT MASTER (SH)**

**(DIVYA BABBAR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)**