



My Dear Friend

I am publishing Research book under head 51 FAQs on Investigations by CBI & ED for 73,006 Cr. Bank frauds by Reliance Anil Ambani Group (RAAG)

- ***This Research book is published under our awareness mission for Residents and Non-Residents for knowing about Investigations by CBI & ED for 73,006 Cr. Bank frauds by Reliance Anil Ambani Group (RAAG). This research book's publication is inspired from thought process of Honorable Prime Minister of India.***

You requested to subscribe our You-tube channel for quick availability for reading 100% Articles as published on different topics till date

<https://www.youtube.com/@satishagarwal303>

&

https://femainindia.com/resource/Reserach_Paper.aspx

&

https://taxguru.in/author/satishagarwal307_1957

- ***With best wishes from CA. Satish Agarwal, New Delhi*** ●



51 FAQs on Investigations by CBI & ED for 73,006 Cr. Bank frauds by RAAG

INDEX

S. No	Topics	Page No.
Chapter - I - Introduction		
1.	<i>What is the INR 73,006 crore Bank fraud case against Anil Ambani Group?</i>	5 & 6
2.	<i>Who are the investigation agencies?</i>	6 & 7
3.	<i>How many cases are registered by CBI and ED?</i>	7
4.	<i>Why this investigation is significant?</i>	7 & 8
5.	<i>What are the main allegations?</i>	8 to 10
6.	<i>Whether public officials are involved?</i>	10
7.	<i>What is the loan fraud in this case?</i>	11
8.	<i>What are areas focused by ED?</i>	12 & 13
9.	<i>What is project help?</i>	13
10.	<i>What is shocking transaction was found?</i>	14 & 15
11.	<i>What is NBFCs' role?</i>	15 to 17
12.	<i>Why Supreme Court is involved?</i>	17 & 18
13.	<i>What is Supreme Court's order?</i>	18 to 20
14.	<i>Whether Supreme Court has declared guilty?</i>	20 & 21
15.	<i>How the alleged fraud committed?</i>	21 to 23
16.	<i>Whether IBC processes were manipulated?</i>	23 & 24
17.	<i>Whether evergreening was involved?</i>	24 & 25
18.	<i>Whether multiple companies are involved?</i>	25 to 27
19.	<i>What is CBI's role?</i>	27 to 29

20.	<i>What is ED's role?</i>	29 to 31
21.	<i>Whether Special Investigation Team (SIT) is formed by ED?</i>	31 & 32
22.	<i>What is impact of alleged fraud of INR 73,006 crore?</i>	32 to 34
23.	<i>Whether Banking and financial sector is affected?</i>	34 to 36
24.	<i>What is latest legal position of case?</i>	36 & 37
25.	<i>What is the name of Acts/Laws involved?</i>	37 & 38
26.	<i>What is process involved?</i>	39 to 41
27.	<i>What is impact of Haircut in IBC?</i>	42 & 43
28.	<i>Whether money will be recovered?</i>	43 & 44
29.	<i>Whether banks are able to recover losses?</i>	44 & 45
30.	<i>What is happening now?</i>	45 & 46
31.	<i>What is conclusion till date?</i>	46 & 47

Chapter - II – The Supreme Court's Monitoring

32.	<i>What are Supreme Court's stands till date?</i>	48
33.	<i>What are Supreme Court's initial observations?</i>	48 & 49
34.	<i>What are Supreme Court's further observations?</i>	49 & 50
35.	<i>What is matter informed by ED to the Supreme Court?</i>	50
36.	<i>What is Supreme Court's directive?</i>	50 & 51

Chapter - III – Investigation by ED

37.	<i>What is reported by ED to the Supreme Court?</i>	52
-----	---	----

Chapter - IV – Investigation by CBI

38.	<i>What are Investigations by CBI?</i>	53
39.	<i>What are informed by CBI to the Supreme Court?</i>	53

Chapter - V – Provisional attachments and arrest the executives by ED

40.	<i>What is INR 3034.90 crore provisionally attachment?</i>	54 & 55
41.	<i>What is arrest of Amitabh Jhunjunwala and Amit Bapna?</i>	55 to 57
42.	<i>What is INR 581.65 crore provisionally attachment?</i>	57 & 58

43.	<i>What is Pali Hill Residential property's provisional attachment?</i>	<i>58 & 59</i>
44.	<i>What is INR 1,885 crore provisionally attachment?</i>	<i>59 to 62</i>
45.	<i>What is INR 1,120 crore provisionally attachment?</i>	<i>62 & 63</i>
46.	<i>What is INR 1,452 crore provisionally attachment?</i>	<i>64 & 65</i>
47.	<i>What is INR 3,083 crore provisionally attachment?</i>	<i>65 to 67</i>

Chapter - VI – Investigations and arrest the executives by CBI

48.	<i>What are searches in RAAG Cases at 7 Locations?</i>	<i>68 & 69</i>
49.	<i>What are searches in RAAG Cases at 17 Locations?</i>	<i>69 & 70</i>
50.	<i>What is arrest of D Vishwanath and Anil Kalya?</i>	<i>70 to 72</i>
51.	<i>What is Chargesheet dated Sep 18, 25 for frauds by RAAG Companies?</i>	<i>72 & 73</i>

Profile of Publisher for 51 FAQs on Investigations by CBI & ED for 73,006 Cr. Bank frauds by RAAG



51 FAQs on Investigations by CBI & ED for 73,006 Cr. Bank frauds by RAAG

Chapter - I - Introduction

1. What is the INR 73,006 crore Bank fraud case against Anil Ambani Group?

- The INR 73,006 crore bank fraud case **refers to a major investigation by India's Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) and Enforcement Directorate (ED) into alleged loan fraud, diversion of funds, and misuse of insolvency proceedings involving companies linked to the Reliance Anil Dhirubhai Ambani Group (ADAG), led by Anil Ambani. CBI and ED are examining the following alleged fraud mechanisms:**
 - (i) **Obtaining Loans Through Misrepresentation**
Companies are alleged to have **secured loans by presenting inflated project viability, misleading financial statements, or incorrect disclosures about repayment capacity and collateral.**
 - (ii) **Diversion of Borrowed Money**
Instead of using loans for approved telecom, infrastructure, power, or business projects, investigators suspect that portions of the money were routed to:
 - (a) Related companies
 - (b) Shell entities
 - (c) Layered transactions
 - (d) Other unauthorized purposes
 - (iii) **Round-Tripping of Funds**
Agencies are probing whether **funds moved between interconnected companies to create an appearance of legitimate business activity or stronger financial health.**



(iv) **Evergreening of Loans**

Some probes reportedly examine whether **fresh loans** or restructuring arrangements were **used to repay old loans** temporarily, **masking the true financial condition** of the borrowing companies.

(v) **Default Causing Massive Bank Losses**

After the companies allegedly became unable to repay, **the loans turned into large non-performing assets (NPAs)**, **causing substantial losses to banks**, many of them **public-sector institutions**.

(vi) **Possible Collusion with Bank Officials**

Investigators are also examining whether **certain bank or financial institution officials** ignored warning signs, **bypassed due diligence**, or improperly approved loans and **restructuring packages**.

(vii) **Conclusion**

(a) The **INR 73,006 crore figure** broadly **represents the total exposure** and suspected fraudulent transactions **under scrutiny across multiple ADAG-linked entities and loan accounts**.

(b) The **investigations are ongoing**, and these remain allegations under examination, **“no” final court verdict** has yet determined criminal liability **in the overall matter**.

2. Who are the investigation agencies?

(i) **Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI)**

The **CBI is leading the criminal investigation** into alleged bank loan frauds and has reportedly registered multiple **FIRs** against ADAG-linked companies.

(ii) **Enforcement Directorate (ED)**

The **ED is conducting parallel money laundering and irregularities investigations**, including alleged misuse of **insolvency proceedings** and fund diversion.



(iii) ***A Special Investigation Team (SIT)***

Reports indicate that an SIT was constituted to coordinate and scrutinize the large-scale financial transactions and related irregularities.

- *The Supreme Court of India is monitoring aspects of the investigation and has directed the agencies to conduct a fair and time-bound probe.*

3. How many cases are registered by CBI and ED?

(i) *The Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) is investigating 7 cases related to alleged bank loan frauds involving the Anil Ambani-led ADAG group, with total alleged exposure of about INR 73,006 crore.*

(ii) (a) *The Enforcement Directorate (ED) has registered multiple money-laundering investigations linked to these fraud allegations.*

(b) *Public reports specifically confirm at least 1 ECIR (ED case) based on a CBI FIR in the INR 2,929 crore SBI-linked fraud matter, while the ED is also conducting broader connected probes into alleged fund diversion and insolvency irregularities.*

(c) *However, the exact total number of ED cases in the overall INR 73,006 crore matter has “not” been publicly disclosed*

4. Why this investigation is significant?

(i) ***One of India’s Largest Alleged Banking Fraud Cases***

The amount involved around INR 73,006 crore makes it one of the biggest alleged bank fraud investigations in India’s banking history. The case concerns loans from a consortium of public-sector and private banks, raising concerns about systemic lending failures.

(ii) ***Impact on Public Sector Banks and Taxpayers***

Many of the affected lenders are government-owned banks. Large unpaid corporate loans increase non-performing assets (NPAs), which can ultimately affect public finances, banking stability, and taxpayer resources.



(iii) ***Allegations of Fund Diversion and Financial Misconduct***

Investigators are examining allegations that loan funds were diverted through complex corporate structures, related-party transactions, and shell entities instead of being used for approved business purposes.

(iv) ***Multiple Agencies Involved***

The involvement of agencies such as the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) and the Enforcement Directorate (ED) indicates the matter goes beyond simple loan default and may involve criminal conspiracy, cheating, and money laundering allegations.

(v) ***Corporate Governance and Banking Oversight Questions***

The case has intensified scrutiny on how banks approved and monitored large corporate loans, risk assessment practices, auditing standards, and the accountability of company management and financial institutions.

(vi) ***Precedent for High-Profile Corporate Accountability***

Because the case involves a prominent industrial group, it is being closely watched as a test of India's ability to investigate and prosecute large-scale white-collar financial crime involving influential business entities.

(vii) ***Implications for Insolvency and Recovery Mechanisms***

The investigation may influence how India applies the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), debt recovery processes, and anti-fraud regulations in future large corporate default cases.

5. What are the main allegations?

(i) ***Diversion of Loan Funds***

Investigators allege that large bank loans taken by "certain" ADAG companies were diverted away from their stated business purposes through layered transactions, interconnected entities, and related-party dealings.



(ii) ***Cheating and Criminal Conspiracy***

The Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) has reportedly examined whether company officials and others **conspired to obtain loans using** misleading financial information, **false assurances**, or concealment of financial stress.

(iii) ***Money Laundering***

The Enforcement Directorate (ED) is probing whether proceeds from alleged fraud were **routed through shell companies** or complex transactions **to disguise the origin** and movement of funds.

(iv) ***Misrepresentation of Financial Position***

Some allegations involve companies **allegedly overstating assets**, revenues, project viability, or repayment capacity **while seeking loans from** banks and **financial institutions**.

(v) ***Violation of Banking Norms***

Investigators are examining **whether lending norms**, collateral requirements, and due-diligence procedures **were bypassed** or inadequately followed **when the loans were sanctioned**.

(vi) ***Round-Tripping and Related-Party Transactions***

Agencies are scrutinizing transactions between associated entities to determine **whether funds were circulated** among group-linked companies **to artificially improve financial statements or conceal defaults**.

(vii) ***Irregularities in Insolvency Proceedings***

Certain probes reportedly **focus on whether insolvency** and restructuring **mechanisms** under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code **were misused to delay recovery or reduce liabilities** owed to lenders.



(viii) **Creation or Use of Shell Companies**

Authorities are investigating whether shell or intermediary companies were used to route funds, hide beneficial ownership, or move money outside the intended borrowing structure.

- **The investigations are ongoing, and these are allegations under examination by agencies, no final judicial determination of guilt has been made.**

6. Whether public officials are involved?

(i) **The allegations under examination include:**

(a) **Possible collusion or connivance by officials in financial institutions and banks while sanctioning or restructuring large loans.**

(b) **Alleged bypassing of due-diligence and risk-assessment procedures.**

(c) **Granting of undue benefits to ADAG-linked entities.**

(d) **Possible irregularities involving insolvency proceedings and settlements.**

(ii) **The Supreme Court observed that investigators should examine whether there was “collusion and connivance by public officials, especially those in financial institutions.”**

(iii) **In at least one related FIR concerning an alleged INR 2,929 crore fraud involving Reliance Communications and State Bank of India, the CBI named “unknown public servants” among the accused persons being investigated.**

(iv) **Additionally, some related investigations and chargesheets have examined alleged links between ADAG companies and senior banking officials, including former Yes Bank executives.**

(v) **However, as of now, investigations are ongoing, and “no” court has conclusively established the guilt of any public official in the overall INR 73,006 crore matter.**



7. What is the loan fraud in this case?

- A business can fail and be **unable to repay loans without** committing **fraud**. For **investigators** to allege fraud, they generally **need evidence that the loans** were obtained, **used**, or managed **through** deception, **misrepresentation**, diversion of funds, or **other dishonest conduct**. The current cases are **investigations** and allegations **guilt** would have **to be established** through the legal process.
- (i) **What investigators are alleging?**
 - **Loans sanctioned without proper due diligence**
 - (a) Some **loans** were allegedly **approved** “before” **normal credit checks** and **documentation** were completed.
 - (b) There are allegations of **backdated approval documents**.
- (ii) **What is diversion of borrowed money?**
 - (a) **Funds** allegedly **moved to related entities**, group companies, or shell companies **rather than** being used for the **stated purpose** of the loan.
 - (b) Investigators say **some loans** were **onward-lent** almost **immediately** “after” **disbursement**.
- (iii) **What is use of shell or connected entities?**
 - The ED has alleged that **networks of companies** with common links were **used to route funds** and obscure their final destination.
- (iv) **What is possible collusion or quid pro quo?**
 - (a) Investigators have examined **whether** certain bank officials or **promoters** **received benefits in** connection with loan **approvals**.
 - (b) These are **allegations** under investigation, **not proven findings**.
- (v) **What is manipulation of insolvency or recovery processes?**
 - The **ED** told the **Supreme Court** it found alleged **irregularities in** certain insolvency proceedings and **settlements** involving **claims** worth thousands of crores that were reportedly settled **for much smaller amounts**



8. What are areas focused by ED?

- *The Enforcement Directorate (ED) is primarily focusing on 4 major areas in the alleged INR 73,006-crore bank fraud investigation linked to the Reliance Anil Dhirubhai Ambani Group and Anil Ambani:*
 - (i) ***Diversion and laundering of bank funds***

ED is probing whether loans taken by group companies — especially Reliance Communications — were diverted through related entities, shell firms, or layered transactions instead of being used for the stated business purposes.
 - (ii) ***Irregularities in insolvency (IBC) proceedings***

The agency told the Supreme Court that it found suspicious patterns in insolvency resolutions under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC). According to the ED report, a process internally referred to as “Project Help” allegedly used 8 NBFCs to arrange funding and manipulate insolvency proceedings.
 - (iii) ***Huge settlement discounts on claims***

ED flagged that claims worth about INR 2,983 crore were allegedly settled for only around INR 26 crore, raising concerns about undervaluation and misuse of the insolvency framework.
 - (iv) ***Role of officials and possible collusion***

Along with the CBI, the ED is examining whether public servants, bank officials, and others may have enabled or overlooked alleged fraudulent transactions and loan misuse.
 - (v) ***Additional developments include:***
 - (a) *The Supreme Court ordered a “fair, transparent and time-bound” probe and is monitoring the investigation.*



- (b) **ED has already attached assets worth over INR 19,344 crore in cases linked to the group, including INR 3,034.90 crore in the RCom matter alone.**
- (c) **Multiple FIRs were registered by CBI based on complaints from banks such as State Bank of India, Bank of Baroda and others.**

9. What is project help?

- (i) **In the INR 73,006-crore alleged bank fraud investigation involving the Anil Ambani group, “Project Help” is the name the Enforcement Directorate (ED) gave to a suspected arrangement allegedly used to manipulate insolvency proceedings under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC).**
- (ii) **ED’s submissions before the Supreme Court:**
 - (a) **Insolvency proceedings were allegedly “deliberately” initiated through unrelated lenders rather than genuine creditors.**
 - (b) **Funding for these IBC acquisitions was allegedly routed through a network of 8 Non-Banking Financial Companies (NBFCs).**
 - (c) **The ED alleged that claims worth about INR 2,983 crore were settled for only around INR 26 crore, which raised concerns about undervaluation and misuse of the insolvency framework.**
 - (d) **Investigators suspect the mechanism may have been used to provide undue benefits to companies in the Reliance Anil Dhirubhai Ambani Group (RAAG) during insolvency resolution processes.**
- (iii) **The Supreme Court observed that the “preliminary facts speak for themselves” and directed the CBI and ED to jointly investigate possible irregularities, collusion, and misconduct involving financial institutions and public officials.**
- (iv) **The “Project Help” is not a government scheme — it is the ED’s label for an alleged coordinated mechanism involving lenders, NBFCs, and insolvency processes that investigators believe may have helped reduce or restructure massive liabilities improperly.**



10. What is shocking transaction was found?

- In the INR 73,006-crore alleged bank fraud probe involving the Anil Ambani group, **the term** “shocking transactions” (as reported from Enforcement Directorate submissions) **does not refer to a single payment, but to a set of highly irregular financial movements** that investigators say raised serious red flags. **The key “shocking” or unusual transactions flagged include:**
 - (i) **Extremely steep loan settlements**
 - (a) One of the most highlighted findings is **that claims** worth around INR **2,983 crore were allegedly settled for just about INR 26 crore** during insolvency resolution processes linked mainly to Reliance Communications.
 - (b) Investigators view this as an **unusually deep haircut** that may **indicate manipulation** or preferential treatment.
 - (ii) **Fund diversion through layered entities**

The ED suspects that large **bank loans were “not” used for their stated telecom or infrastructure purposes, but were instead routed through:**

 - (a) Related companies
 - (b) Shell or intermediary firms
 - (c) Layered transactions across group entities
 - This pattern is treated as **a classic “round-tripping” or diversion mechanism.**
 - (iii) **Suspicious insolvency-linked deals (“Project Help” context)**

Under what investigators refer to internally as “Project Help,” **funds allegedly moved through “multiple” NBFCs and structured financing channels to influence insolvency outcomes, rather than through transparent creditor-driven processes.**
 - (iv) **Inter-company adjustments and write-offs**
 - **Another flagged pattern involves:**



- (a) *Inter-company **lending** “without” **proper recovery***
- (b) ***Loan write-offs** or restructuring at “unusually” **favourable terms***
- (c) ***Possible masking of stressed assets** within group entities*
- (v) ***Possible undervaluation of assets and claims***

Authorities also found cases where **asset values and creditor claims were significantly reduced**, raising suspicion that the insolvency process was “not” **fully market-driven**.

11. What is NBFCs’ role?

- *In the INR 73,006-crore alleged bank **fraud investigation** involving the Anil Ambani group, Non-Banking Financial Companies (NBFCs) are alleged to have **played a key intermediary and structuring role** in how funds moved and **how** “certain” **insolvency outcomes** were **influenced**. According to ED and CBI allegations, **their role is broadly understood in these ways**:*
 - (i) ***Funding channel in alleged “Project Help”***
 - *Investigators have observed that 8 NBFCs were allegedly used under “Project Help” for:*
 - (a) ***Routing funds into stressed assets** of companies like Reliance Communications*
 - (b) ***Providing bridge financing** or structured loans that indirectly supported acquisition or settlement processes*
 - (c) ***Helping arrange liquidity** when traditional banks were unwilling to extend fresh credit*
 - (d) ***Conclusion***

8 NBFCs are suspected of acting as financial conduits between lenders, stressed companies, and resolution buyers.
 - (ii) ***Layering and routing of funds***
 - *ED have suspected 8 NBFCs were used for:*



- (a) *Moving money through **multiple layers of lending and refinancing***
- (b) ***Masking the original source and end-use of funds***
- (c) ***Creating complex transaction chains that made tracing difficult***
- (d) ***Conclusion***

*This is one of the reasons **investigators view** the structure as potentially **facilitating “layering” in money flow**, a common concern in fraud probes.*

(iii) ***Participation in insolvency-linked transactions (IBC space)***

- ***NBFCs have allegedly helped structure deals during insolvency proceedings for:***

- (a) ***Funding bidders** or related entities in insolvency auctions*
- (b) ***Supporting settlements** where liabilities were sharply reduced*
- (c) ***Participating in transactions** where creditor claims were heavily discounted*
- (d) ***Conclusion***

*The ED has flagged cases where **large claims were reportedly settled at a fraction of their value**, raising suspicion about how financing was arranged.*

(iv) ***Possible indirect influence on outcomes***

- ***Authorities are also examining whether NBFC-facilitated funding for:***

- (a) ***Influencing resolution** plans to be succeeded*
- (b) ***Enabling “related-party” transactions***
- (c) ***Affecting fair valuation** of stressed assets*
- (d) ***Conclusion***

*The **Supreme Court has asked for a coordinated probe** into banking and insolvency irregularities **linked to the group headed by Anil Ambani**.*



(v) **Final conclusion**

- **NBFCs are alleged to have acted as middle-layer financiers, helping move money between banks, group companies, and insolvency transactions for:**
 - (a) **Obscuring** true fund flows
 - (b) **Enabling** restructuring deals
 - (c) **Supporting** irregular settlements

12. Why Supreme Court is involved?

- **The Supreme Court is involved in the INR 73,006-crore alleged bank fraud case linked to the Anil Ambani group because the matter is “not” just a routine financial dispute—it raises systemic concerns about banking fraud, insolvency processes, and possible institutional failure across multiple agencies and banks.**
- (i) **Allegations of large-scale banking fraud affecting public money**
 - (a) **The case involves loans from multiple public sector banks allegedly misused or diverted by companies such as Reliance Communications (RCOM) and other Reliance ADA Group entities linked to Anil Ambani.**
 - (b) **This involve public sector banks and public funds; the issue is treated as nationally significant.**
- (ii) **Serious concerns about insolvency (IBC) misuse**
 - **Investigators told the Supreme Court that insolvency proceedings under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC) may have been for:**
 - (a) **Manipulating through** structured funding networks “Project Help”
 - (b) **Influencing by** intermediaries such as NBFCs
 - (c) **Using to allow** unusually large write-offs and settlements
 - (d) **Conclusion**

The Supreme Court stepped in because this raised doubts about whether the IBC framework itself was being misused, not just one company.



(iii) ***Need for independent and coordinated investigation***

● ***Multiple agencies are involved:***

- (a) *Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI)*
- (b) *Enforcement Directorate (ED)*
- (c) *Reserve Bank of India (RBI)*

● ***The Supreme Court intervened to ensure that:***

- (a) *Investigations are **coordinated, not fragmented***
- (b) *There is **no conflict** or duplication **between agencies***
- (c) *The probe remains **transparent and time-bound***

(iv) ***Allegations of possible institutional collusion or oversight failure***

● ***The ED and CBI have indicated possible issues such as:***

- (a) *Bank officials allegedly **approving questionable loans***
- (b) ***Inadequate monitoring*** of fund usage
- (c) ***Irregularities in loan*** restructuring and settlements
- (d) ***Conclusion***

*This involves **public institutions and possible systemic lapses**, judicial oversight becomes important.*

(v) ***Protection of financial system integrity***

● ***The Supreme Court's concern is broader than one group it includes:***

- (a) ***Maintaining trust*** in India's banking system
- (b) ***Ensuring insolvency laws*** are not misused
- (c) ***Protecting creditor rights*** and public funds
- (d) ***Conclusion***

*The matter as requiring a **"fair, transparent, and time-bound investigation."***

13. What is Supreme Court's order?

● ***Directed a coordinated CBI-ED investigation***

● ***The Supreme Court has supported a joint and structured probe involving:***

- (a) *Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI)*



(b) *Enforcement Directorate (ED)*

(c) **Conclusion**

- ***It emphasised that the investigation into companies like Reliance Communications (RCOM) and other Reliance ADA Group entities linked to Anil Ambani should “not” proceed in a fragmented manner.***

(i) ***Ensured a “fair, transparent and time-bound” probe***

- *The Supreme Court stressed that:*

(a) *the investigation must be **fair and independent***

(b) *it should be conducted **within a reasonable time frame***

(c) *there should be **no delay tactics or procedural gaps***

(d) **Conclusion**

- ***This is important because of the large scale of alleged financial irregularities.***

(ii) ***Allowed agencies to examine insolvency proceedings (IBC angle)***

- *The Supreme Court permitted investigators to also look into:*

(a) ***Alleged irregularities in insolvency resolutions under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC)***

(b) ***Transactions involving asset sales, loan settlements, and creditor claims***

(c) ***Suspected misuse of insolvency mechanisms like “Project Help” allegations mentioned by ED***

(iii) ***Required full cooperation from banks and institutions***

- ***Banks and financial institutions involved in lending were directed to:***

(a) ***Fully cooperate with CBI and ED***

(b) ***Provide documents and transaction records***

(c) ***Assist in tracing fund flows and loan usage***

(iv) ***Oversight role to ensure systemic integrity***

- ***The Supreme Court’s approach reflects concern that the issue may involve:***



- (a) **Public money** from multiple banks
- (b) **Possible systemic failures** in loan monitoring
- (c) **Integrity of insolvency and banking processes**
- (d) **Conclusion**
 - **This role is supervisory**, ensuring accountability in the investigation rather than handling financial adjudication **directly**.

14. Whether Supreme Court has declared guilty?

No

- The **Supreme Court has “not” declared anyone guilty** in INR 73,006-crore alleged bank fraud case involving the Anil Ambani group. Here’s the **important legal position**:
 - (i) **Supreme Court does not decide guilt in such cases**
 - The **Supreme Court is “not” a trial court**:
 - (a) **“Not” conducting criminal trials**
 - (b) **“Not” examining witnesses** like a lower court
 - (c) **“Not” declaring** individuals or companies **guilty** or innocent
 - (d) **Conclusion**
 - **Guilt can only be decided by a competent trial court “after” investigation and evidence.**
 - (ii) **What the Supreme Court has actually done?**
 - **In this case, the Court’s role has been to:**
 - (a) **Allow and monitor investigations by** agencies like **CBI and ED**
 - (b) **Ensure a fair, transparent, and time-bound probe**
 - (c) **Address concerns about alleged misuse** of banking and insolvency processes involving entities like Reliance Communications and others in the Reliance ADA Group linked to Anil Ambani
 - (iii) **Current status of the case**
 - (a) **The matter is still under investigation stage**



- (b) **CBI and ED are collecting evidence, tracing funds, and examining insolvency transactions**
- (c) **“No” court has yet delivered a *final judgment of guilt or conviction***
- (iv) **Key legal principle under Indian law**
 - **“An allegation, even if serious or high-value, is “not” proof of guilt until proven in court.” So, even though large financial irregularities are being investigated, they remain allegations at this stage.**

15. How the alleged fraud committed?

- (i) **Loans taken from multiple banks**
 - **Companies linked to Anil Ambani and his group, including Reliance Communications, are alleged to have taken large loans from public sector banks for telecom and infrastructure projects. Investigators say the core issue began when:**
 - (a) **Loans were sanctioned for specific business purposes**
 - (b) **The actual usage of funds allegedly did “not” match the stated purpose**
- (ii) **Diversion of funds**
 - **A key allegation is *diversion of bank loans*, where money was allegedly:**
 - (a) **Routed to related group companies**
 - (b) **Transferred through intermediary firms**
 - (c) **Used for debt repayment of other entities instead of original projects**
 - (d) **Moved through layered transactions to obscure its trail**
 - (e) **Conclusion**
 - **This is often referred to as “fund diversion” or “round-tripping”.**
- (iii) **Role of insolvency process (IBC angle)**
 - **During financial stress, some group companies entered insolvency under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC). Investigators allege:**



- (a) **Insolvency resolutions were influenced** through structured arrangements (“Project Help”)
- (b) **Assets and liabilities were settled at “heavily” discounted values**
- (c) **Creditor claims** worth thousands of crores were allegedly **settled for a fraction of their value**

- (iv) **Use of NBFCs and structured funding**
 - The ED has flagged **that** “certain” Non-Banking Financial Companies (NBFCs) **may have:**
 - (a) **Provided bridge funding** to stressed assets
 - (b) **Helped route money** between entities
 - (c) **Created layered financing structures** that made fund tracing difficult
 - (d) **Conclusion**
 - This is suspected to have **supported “both” lending and insolvency-related transactions.**

- (v) **Undervalued settlements and write-offs**
 - Another major allegation is that:
 - (a) **Large debts** were allegedly written off or **settled at very low values**
 - (b) **Creditor losses** were significantly **higher than** expected in “normal” **commercial recovery**
 - (c) **Conclusion**
 - This raised **suspicion of preferential or manipulated settlements.**

- (vi) **Possible institutional involvement (under probe)**
 - Investigators are also examining whether:
 - (a) Bank officials **approved loans “without” adequate safeguards**
 - (b) **Monitoring of fund usage was weak**
 - (c) **Restructuring decisions** were influenced or **improperly handled**



(vii) Important clarification

- *None of this has been **proven in court**. At this stage:*
 - (a) These are **allegations by investigative agencies***
 - (b) The **Supreme Court** has only allowed and **monitored the probe***
 - (c) “No” **conviction** or judicial finding of fraud **has been made***

16. Whether IBC processes were manipulated?

- *Key allegations under scrutiny are **whether** Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC) processes were manipulated. However, this is **not a proven finding***
- (i) Allegation of “structured manipulation” of insolvency cases*
 - *Investigators have **told courts that insolvency proceedings** involving companies linked to Reliance Communications may have been **influenced through structured arrangements**. They suspect that:*
 - (a) Insolvency cases were “not” **driven purely by genuine creditor action***
 - (b) “Certain” **resolution** outcomes may have been **pre-planned** or influenced*
- (ii) “Project Help” financing pattern (ED allegation)*
 - *The ED has flagged what it calls “Project Help”, where:*
 - (a) **Multiple NBFCs** allegedly provided **coordinated funding***
 - (b) **Funds** may have been **used to support acquisition** or resolution plans*
 - (c) **Financial structuring** could have **influenced insolvency** outcomes*
 - (d) **Conclusion***
 - *This raises suspicion of **external influence on the IBC process**, which is supposed to be **market-driven**.*
- (iii) Alleged steep undervaluation of settlements*
 - *One of the most cited concerns is that:*
 - (a) **Creditor claims** worth thousands of crores were allegedly **settled at extremely low values***
 - (b) **Large claims** were reportedly **reduced to a fraction** of their value*



(c) Conclusion

- Investigators view this as potentially **indicating** “non” **transparent resolution outcomes**.

(iv) Role of intermediaries and financial institutions

- The probe is also examining whether:
 - Banks** and financial institutions approved or **supported resolutions** “without” **adequate scrutiny**
 - NBFCs** and intermediaries **facilitated funding for specific outcomes**
 - There was **inadequate due diligence** in insolvency approvals

(v) What the Supreme Court is concerned about

- The Supreme Court has “not” **found manipulation but has allowed investigation** because:
 - IBC** is a **critical** financial reform law
 - Misuse** could **undermine trust** in insolvency resolution system
 - Allegations **involve large public money** exposure
 - Conclusion**
 - It has therefore **supported a coordinated, transparent investigation**.

(vi) Current legal position

- “No” court has ruled **that IBC was manipulated**
- These remain **allegations under investigation**
- Final determination will depend on evidence** presented in trial courts

17. Whether evergreening was involved?

- “Evergreening of loans” is one of the practices being **examined by investigators**, but it has “not” been **legally proven** yet.
- Loan restructuring instead of recovery**
 - Loans allegedly under stress** were repeatedly **restructured**
 - Fresh credit** or refinancing may have been **used to repay earlier dues**



(ii) **Roll-over of stressed exposures**

- (a) **Some loans** are suspected to have been “rolled over” **through new facilities**
- (b) This may have **delayed classification as non-performing assets (NPAs)**

(iii) **Use of intermediary funding (NBFC angle)**

- (a) Certain **NBFCs** are alleged to have **helped structure refinancing**
- (b) This could have **indirectly supported** loan rollovers or **repayments**

(iv) **Masking of financial stress**

- Investigators are examining whether repeated restructuring:
 - (a) **Delayed recognition** of bad loans
 - (b) **Gave a false impression** of repayment ability
 - (c) **Allowed** continued **credit exposure** from banks

(v) **Important clarification**

- (a) There is “no” **court finding** yet that evergreening occurred
- (b) These are **investigation-stage allegations**, not proven facts
- (c) The **Supreme Court** has only allowed and monitored the probe; it has not ruled on wrongdoing

18. Whether multiple companies are involved?

Yes.

- It **involves** multiple companies across the **Reliance ADA Group** and several **associated financial entities**, according to allegations **being examined by the CBI and ED**.

(i) **Core companies under scrutiny**

- The main group companies being examined include:
 - (a) **RCOM Ltd. a major focus of insolvency-related allegations**
 - (b) **Other** Reliance ADA Group **entities** linked to Anil Ambani such as **infrastructure, telecom, and financial services arms**



(c) **Conclusion**

- **These companies are central** because **they** are alleged to have received large bank loans and participated in restructuring and insolvency processes.

(ii) **Banks and financial institutions involved**

- **Multiple public sector banks** are part of the case because they are alleged lenders, including:

(a) **State Bank of India (SBI)**

(b) **Bank of Baroda (BoB)**

(c) **Other “consortium” banks** (as part of lending arrangements)

(d) **Conclusion**

- The investigation **focuses on how funds** from multiple banks were collectively exposed.

(iii) **NBFCs and intermediary entities**

- A significant **number of Non-Banking Financial Companies (NBFCs)** are also under the scanner. They are **suspected** to have:

(a) **Routed funds** between companies

(b) **Supported refinancing** or structured lending

(c) **Played a role** in what investigators call “Project Help”

(d) **Participated indirectly** in insolvency-related transactions

(iv) **Shell or related entities (alleged layer structure)**

- Investigators are also examining **whether**:

(a) **Funds were routed** through related-party companies

(b) **Intermediary firms** were used to move money in layers

(c) Transactions were **structured to obscure the end use of funds**

(v) **Why so many entities are involved**

- The case is **multi-entity** because the allegations **involve**:



- (a) **Loan origination** (banks)
 - (b) **Fund routing** (NBFCs/intermediaries)
 - (c) **Borrowing companies** (Reliance ADA Group entities)
 - (d) **Insolvency resolution buyers and processes** (IBC framework)
- (vi) **Current status**
- (a) “No” **company** or individual has been **convicted**
 - (b) The **involvement** of multiple entities **is part of ongoing investigation findings and allegations**
 - (c) **Courts** are **monitoring the probe** due to its scale and complexity

19. What is CBI's role?

- The **CBI** is the **primary criminal investigating agency handling the alleged bank fraud** case involving the Anil Ambani group, which is pegged at about INR 73,006 crore in exposure **across banks**.
- (i) **Investigating criminal banking fraud**
- The CBI is examining **whether loans taken by companies linked to Anil Ambani** and entities such as Reliance Communications **involved** for:
 - (a) **Cheating banks** at the time of loan sanction
 - (b) **Misusing** or diverting loan **funds**
 - (c) **Criminal conspiracy** among borrowers and others
 - (d) **Conclusion**
 - This falls under **offences like cheating, criminal breach of trust, and conspiracy under Indian law**.
- (ii) **Filing FIRs based on bank complaints**
- The **investigation** began “after” **complaints** from banks:
 - (a) **State Bank of India (SBI)**
 - (b) **Bank of Baroda (BoB)**
 - (c) **Other consortium lenders**



(d) **Conclusion**

- **CBI registered “multiple” FIRs based on these complaints alleging that large loans were “not” repaid and funds were allegedly diverted.**

(iii) **Tracing end-use of funds**

- **A major part of CBI’s work is to:**

(a) **Tracking** how loan **money** was actually **used**

(b) **Identifying** whether **funds** were **diverted to** related entities or **unrelated purposes**

(c) **Verifying** whether **projects** financed by banks were **genuinely executed**

(iv) **Investigating inter-company and related-party transactions**

- **CBI is also examining:**

(a) **Transactions** between group companies

(b) **Possible routing** of funds **through** shell or **related firms**

(c) **Whether internal transfers** were **used to mask loan misuse**

(v) **Coordination with ED for money laundering angle**

- **CBI handles the criminal fraud aspect, while the ED investigates:**

(a) **Money laundering**

(b) **Asset attachment**

(c) **Proceeds of Crime (PoC)**

(d) **Conclusion**

- **ED and CBI are working in parallel and sharing findings with each other.**

(vi) **Role in insolvency-related scrutiny**

- **CBI is also looking at whether:**

(a) **Loan defaults** were artificially **managed**

(b) **Insolvency proceedings** under the IBC were **influenced** or **misused**

(c) **Recovery processes** were affected by **improper** arrangements



(vii) Court-monitored investigation

- *Because of the scale and complexity, the Supreme Court has supported a:*
 - (a) Coordinated investigation by CBI and ED*
 - (b) Time-bound and transparent probe*
 - (c) Focus on systemic banking issues, not just individual transactions*

20. What is ED's role?

- *The Enforcement Directorate (ED) plays a **financial investigation and money-laundering role** in the INR 73,006-crore alleged bank fraud case involving the Anil Ambani group. Its mandate is different from the CBI and **focuses on what happened "after" the alleged fraud**—how the **money** moved and whether it was **laundered** or concealed.*
- (i) Money laundering investigation (core role)*
 - *The ED investigates **whether proceeds from alleged bank fraud were:***
 - (a) Diverted from original loan purposes*
 - (b) Moved through multiple companies or accounts*
 - (c) Layered to hide the source of funds*
 - (d) Used to acquire assets or repay other obligations*
 - (e) Conclusion*
 - *This is under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) 2002.*
- (ii) Tracking "PoC"*
 - *The **ED traces money** allegedly linked to companies of Anil Ambani, including entities like Reliance Communications, **for determining:***
 - (a) Where the loan **funds ultimately went***
 - (b) Whether they were **used for legitimate business** or diverted*
 - (c) Whether **assets** were created **from suspicious funds***
- (iii) Attachment of assets*
 - *When **ED believes**, assets are linked to alleged **PoC**, it can:*



- (a) **Temporarily attach properties, shares, or bank accounts**
- (b) **Prevent disposal of assets during investigation**
- (c) **Confiscation “after” court confirmation**
- (d) **Conclusion**
 - **ED has reportedly attached or identified large-value assets linked to the group as part of its probe.**

- (iv) **Investigating complex fund structures (“layering”)**
 - **ED focuses on how money may have been moved through:**
 - (a) **Multiple group companies**
 - (b) **Shell or intermediary entities**
 - (c) **Non-Banking Financial Companies (NBFCs)**
 - (d) **Structured financing arrangements, including what it calls “Project Help”**
 - (e) **Conclusion**
 - **The goal is to uncover whether layering was used to obscure fund flows.**

- (v) **Insolvency and settlement scrutiny**
 - **ED is also examining whether insolvency processes under the IBC were misused, like:**
 - (a) **Unusually large loan write-offs or settlements**
 - (b) **Acquisition of stressed assets through structured funding**
 - (c) **Transactions that may have reduced creditor recoveries**

- (vi) **Coordination with CBI**
 - (a) **CBI**
Investigating predicate offence like fraud, cheating, criminal conspiracy
 - (b) **ED**
Investigating money laundering of proceeds from that fraud
 - (c) **Conclusion**
CBI and ED are sharing findings, but their legal focus is different.



(vii) **Court-monitored probe**

- The **Supreme Court** has **allowed** ED's involvement as part of a:
 - (a) **Coordinated CBI-ED investigation**
 - (b) **Time-bound and transparent probe**
 - (c) **Effort to ensure banking system integrity**

21. Whether Special Investigation Team (SIT) is formed by ED?

No.

- **A Special Investigation Team (SIT) has "not" been formed by the ED in the INR 73,006-crore alleged bank fraud case involving the Anil Ambani group.**
 - (i) **"No" ED SIT exists in this case**
 - (a) **ED is investigating** the matter within its regular structure **under** the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) 2002
 - (b) **ED has "not" announced** or created any separate **SIT** specifically **for this case**
 - (c) **Conclusion**
 - **Reports of an "ED SIT" in this context are "not" accurate.**
 - (ii) **Who is actually handling the case?**
 - **The investigation is being handled through:**
 - (a) **CBI is investigating for** criminal fraud, cheating, and conspiracy
 - (b) **ED is investigating for** money laundering and tracing PoC
 - (c) **Conclusion**
 - **CBI and ED are working in coordination, but "not" through a joint SIT created by ED.**
 - (iii) **Why SIT confusion arises**
 - **The term "SIT" is sometimes mistakenly used** because:
 - (a) **Courts often order SITs** in high-profile scams
 - (b) **ED and CBI are coordinating closely, which can look like an SIT type structure**
 - (c) **Conclusion**
 - **Legally, this case is "not" being handled by an SIT.**



(iv) Supreme Court's role

- **The Supreme Court has "only" directed:**
 - (a) **A coordinated and time-bound investigation**
 - (b) **Cooperation between CBI and ED**
 - (c) **Transparency in handling allegations involving banks and insolvency processes**
 - (d) **Conclusion**
 - **The Supreme court has "not" ordered formation of an SIT.**
- (v) Current structure of investigation**
- (a) **The CBI is investigating criminal frauds**
 - (b) **The ED is investigating money launderings**
 - (c) **The Banks are providing documents and loan records**
 - (d) **The Supreme Court is monitoring progress and ensure fairness**

22. What is impact of alleged fraud of INR 73,006 crore?

- **The alleged INR 73,006-crore bank fraud case linked to the Anil Ambani group has "no" final judicial finding yet, but if the allegations under investigation by the CBI and ED are considered at face value, the potential impact spans banking, markets, legal systems, and public trust.**
- (i) Impact on Public Sector Banks (PSBs)**
- **The biggest direct impact is on lenders' balance sheets:**
 - (a) **Large loans from SBI, BoB and other banks are under stress**
 - (b) **Potential non-performing assets (NPAs) increase**
 - (c) **Banks may have to make higher provisioning for losses**
 - (d) **Reduced capital availability for fresh lending**
 - (e) **Conclusion**

Money goes from the banking system may "not" be fully recoverable.
- (ii) Impact on financial system stability**
- **Because the exposure is large and spread across multiple institutions:**



- (a) *It raises concerns about **credit risk assessment failures***
- (b) *Highlights **weaknesses in loan monitoring** and restructuring practices*
- (c) ***Affects confidence in consortium lending** systems*
- (d) **Conclusion**

*Therefore, **RBI and Supreme court** are **closely watching** the case.*

(iii) **Impact on insolvency (IBC) framework credibility**

- (a) ***Trust in the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC) process***
- (b) ***Perception of fairness in resolution outcomes***
- (c) ***Confidence in how creditors recover dues***
- (d) **Conclusion**

*If proven, misuse of IBC mechanisms could **weaken a key financial reform system.***

(iv) **Market and corporate governance impact**

- *Even at the allegation stage:*

- (a) ***Investor sentiment** toward stressed conglomerates **weakens***
- (b) ***Higher scrutiny of corporate borrowing practices follows***
- (c) ***Stricter due diligence** by banks and investors **is triggered***
- (d) **Conclusion**

*For entities linked to Anil Ambani, **reputational impact is already significant.***

(v) **Regulatory and legal impact**

- *The case has prompted:*

- (a) ***Closer coordination** between CBI and ED*
- (b) ***Stricter monitoring** of large corporate loans*
- (c) ***Review of restructuring** and refinancing norms*
- (d) ***Judicial oversight** by the Supreme Court **for transparency***

(vi) **Public trust impact**

- *One of the most important broader effects is:*

- (a) ***Reduced public confidence** in banking governance*



- (b) **Concern about how large corporate loans is sanctioned and monitored**
- (c) **Perception risk around financial institutions handling public money**
- (vii) **Asset recovery and enforcement impact (if allegations are proven)**
 - **If wrongdoing is eventually established:**
 - (a) **Attached assets may be confiscated by the government**
 - (b) **Recovery processes could take years**
 - (c) **Recovery rates may still be significantly lower than total exposure**
- (viii) **Important clarification**
 - (a) **“No” fraud has been legally proven yet**
 - (b) **The case is still under investigation**
 - (c) **“Impact” here refers to potential systemic and financial consequences based on allegations, “not” confirmed findings**

23. Whether Banking and financial sector is affected?

- **Yes**

The alleged INR 73,006 crore **bank fraud** case linked to the Anil Ambani and the Reliance Anil Ambani Group (RAAG) can significantly affect the banking and financial sector in India in several ways.
- **Major Impacts on the Banking and Financial Sector**
 - (i) **Increase in Non-Performing Assets (NPAs)**
 - (a) **Public and private sector banks that gave loans to RAAG companies may face heavy losses if loans are “not” recovered.**
 - (b) **Large “unpaid” corporate loans weaken bank balance sheets and reduce profitability.**
 - (ii) **Reduced Investor and Depositor Confidence**
 - (a) **Such large fraud allegations create fear among investors for the safety and transparency of the banking system.**
 - (b) **Share prices of affected banks and financial institutions may experience volatility.**



(iii) **Tighter Lending Norms**

- (a) **Banks may become more cautious** while lending to large corporate groups.
- (b) **Credit appraisal, forensic audits, and monitoring systems are likely to become stricter.**

(iv) **Regulatory and Compliance Pressure**

- (a) **Agencies like the RBI, CBI, ED, and SEBI may impose tighter governance and compliance requirements.**
- (b) **Banks may need stronger fraud detection mechanisms and risk management systems.**

(v) **Impact on Credit Flow**

- (a) **Banks suffer large losses, they may reduce lending to businesses and industries**
- (b) **This can slow economic growth** and investment activity.

(vi) **Stress on Financial Institutions**

- (a) **NBFCs, mutual funds, insurance companies, and bond markets linked to the group may also face financial stress.**
- (b) **Exposure through corporate bonds or structured loans can spread risk across the financial system.**

(vii) **Legal and Recovery Costs**

- (a) **Long investigations and court proceedings increase operational and legal expenses for banks and regulators.**

(viii) **Current Status of the Case**

- (a) Reports indicate that the **Supreme Court has allowed the ED and CBI investigations to continue regarding alleged irregularities involving loans and insolvency-related settlements** linked to RAAG companies.
- (b) The **CBI reportedly informed the Supreme Court that multiple cases involving alleged fraudulent bank loans are under investigation, with some charge sheets already filed.**



(ix) Overall Conclusion

- The case **highlights systemic risks in corporate lending and banking governance**. Even “before” **final judicial conclusions** are reached; **such allegations can:**

- (a) **Weaken confidence** in financial institutions
- (b) **Increase regulatory scrutiny**
- (c) **Tighten corporate financing conditions**
- (d) **Push reforms in fraud monitoring and banking supervision.**
- (e) **Conclusion**

The **banking and financial sector** is likely to be **materially affected**, especially **for risk management**, lending practices, and **market confidence**.

24. What is latest legal position of case?

- Presently at the **investigation and charge-sheet stage**, with the Supreme Court of India actively monitoring the probes by the Central Bureau of Investigation (**CBI**) and Enforcement Directorate (**ED**).
- (i) The **Supreme Court** has “not” **ordered Anil Ambani’s arrest**, and recently stated it would be “extremely shy” to direct arrests while investigations are ongoing.
- (ii) The **Supreme Court** has, however, **made clear that** the allegations involve a serious and large-scale banking fraud **requiring thorough investigation**.
- (iii) According to **submissions made** before the Supreme Court like:
 - (a) **9 FIRs** have been registered by the CBI.
 - (b) **2 charge sheets** have already been filed.
 - (c) **7 investigations are still continuing.**
 - (d) The alleged loss in the pending cases is stated by the CBI to be around **INR 27,337 crore**.
- (iv) **The ED has separately alleged:**
 - (a) **Diversion/defaults** of approx. **INR 7,500 crore** in Reliance Home Finance
 - (b) **Diversion/defaults** of approx. **INR 8,200 crore** in Reliance Commercial Finance



- (v) **Separate but related development: “fraud” classification by banks**
- **In April 2026, the Supreme Court also refused to stay the classification of certain loan accounts linked to Anil Ambani as “fraud” by banks such as:**
 - (a) **Bank of Baroda (BoB)**
 - (b) **Indian Overseas Bank (IoB)**
 - (c) **IDBI Bank**
 - (d) **Conclusion**
Banks can continue regulatory action under RBI fraud-account rules.
- (vi) **Important clarification on the INR 73,006 crore figure**
- **Different petitions and reports cite different totals:**
 - (a) **Around INR 27,337 crore in active CBI investigations**
 - (b) **INR 40,000+ crore in the PIL allegations**
 - (c) **Larger aggregate exposure figures like multiple group entities and lenders crossing INR 70,000 crore in some media descriptions.**
 - (d) **Hence INR 73,006 crore figure is a broader claimed exposure estimate, “not” yet a judicially established loss figure.**

25. What is the name of Acts/Laws involved?

- **These cases are being investigated under several Indian laws and regulatory frameworks. Based on court proceedings, ED/CBI actions, and media reports, the main Acts/Laws involved are:**
 - (i) **Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) 2002**
 - **Used by the ED for attachment of assets and money laundering investigations**
 - (ii) **Indian Penal Code (IPC), 1860/ Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023**
Likely sections include:
 - (a) **Cheating (Section 420 of IPC 1860/318 of BNS 2023)**
 - (b) **Criminal breach of trust**
 - (c) **Criminal conspiracy (Section 120B of IPC 1860/61 of BNS 2023)**



(d) *Forgery-related offences*

(e) **Conclusion**

These are **standard provisions in large bank fraud** investigations handled by the CBI.

(iii) **Prevention of Corruption Act (PCA) 1988**

- **Applicable because the CBI stated it is also examining the role of “public servants” and banking officials.**

(iv) **Companies Act (CA) 2013**

- **Potentially invoked for diversion of funds, disclosures, corporate governance violations, and related-party transactions.**

(v) **Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC), 2016**

- **The ED reportedly flagged irregularities in insolvency proceedings connected with group companies like Reliance Communications.**

(vi) **Reserve Bank of India (RBI) Master Directions on Frauds**

- **Banks classified certain loan accounts as “fraud” under RBI fraud-monitoring guidelines. The Supreme Court also dealt with challenges to these classifications.**

(vii) **Banking Regulation Act, 1949 and banking compliance norms**

- **Relevant because the allegations involve large-scale loan defaults and alleged diversion of borrowed funds from public-sector banks and financial institutions.**

(viii) **Fugitive Economic Offenders Act, 2018 (possible relevance if allegations escalate)**

- (a) **Mentioned in related large fraud jurisprudence and ED proceedings, though “not” yet prominently reported against Anil Ambani in this matter.**
- (b) **The investigation currently involves multiple FIRs registered by the CBI and parallel ED proceedings concerning alleged bank loan frauds, diversion of funds, and money laundering linked to several ADAG companies**



26. What is process involved?

(i) **Loan Sanction and Subsequent NPA Classification**

(a) Various **lenders allegedly extended large credit facilities** to entities within the Reliance Communications group and related companies.

(b) Some of these **loan accounts later became stressed assets** and were classified as NPAs by lending institutions.

(ii) **Fraud Identification and Forensic Examination**

(a) **Banks and financial institutions conducted internal reviews, forensic audits, and transaction analyses.**

(b) **Investigators have alleged diversion of funds, routing through related entities, irregular transactions, and other possible violations.**

(c) **These findings formed the basis for fraud complaints and criminal referrals.**

(iii) **Complaints by Banks and Financial Institutions**

- **Complaints were submitted by institutions including:**

(a) State Bank of India

(b) Punjab National Bank

(c) Bank of Baroda

(d) Life Insurance Corporation of India

- **These complaints led to investigations by the CBI and the ED.**

(iv) **CBI Criminal Investigation**

- **The CBI registered multiple FIRs alleging offences such as:**

(a) Criminal conspiracy

(b) Cheating

(c) Diversion of loan funds

(d) Misrepresentation and related offences



- According to **submissions** before the **Supreme Court**, the **CBI reported** that **nine FIRs** had been **registered, investigations** were continuing in **seven cases**, and **chargesheets** had been filed in some cases.
- (v) **ED Money-Laundering Investigation**
 - After predicate offences were registered by **the CBI**, the ED initiated **investigations** under the: **Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002** The ED's role is to determine:
 - (a) Whether proceeds of crime exist;
 - (b) Whether money was layered or concealed;
 - (c) Whether assets were acquired using allegedly diverted funds.
 - **The ED has attached assets worth thousands of crores under PMLA provisions pending adjudication.**
- (vi) **Supreme Court Proceedings**
 - (a) **A PIL filed by E. A. S. Sarma** sought a court-monitored probe.
 - (b) **The Supreme Court directed the investigating agencies** to proceed expeditiously and sought status reports while emphasizing **that the investigations should be conducted independently and fairly.**
 - (c) **The Court also directed formation of a special ED team.**
- (vii) **Special Investigation Team (SIT)**
 - Following Supreme Court directions, the **ED constituted an SIT** of senior officers **to coordinate investigations**, trace money trails, and examine transactions **connected with the alleged bank-fraud cases.**
- (viii) **Chargesheets and Prosecution Complaints**
 - **Once sufficient evidence is gathered:**
 - (a) **The CBI files a chargesheet** before the competent criminal court.
 - (b) **The ED files a prosecution complaint** before the Special PMLA Court.



- ***These filings may include:***
 - (a) *Witness statements*
 - (b) *Banking records*
 - (c) *Audit reports*
 - (d) *Asset-tracing evidence*
 - (e) *Alleged fund-flow analyses*
 - ***The CBI recently reported filing chargesheets in some of investigated matters.***
- (ix) ***Arrests and Custodial Interrogation***
- (a) *Investigating agencies **may arrest persons when** statutory requirements are satisfied and **custodial interrogation is considered necessary.***
 - (b) *Such decisions remain **within the powers of the investigating agencies** and are subject to judicial scrutiny.*
- (x) ***Trial, Confiscation, and Recovery***
- ***If charges are proved during trial, consequences may include:***
 - (a) *Conviction and imprisonment;*
 - (b) *Monetary penalties;*
 - (c) *Confiscation of assets under PMLA;*
 - (d) *Recovery actions benefiting lenders and affected institutions.*
 - ***Under Section 8 of PMLA, confiscated properties may, in appropriate cases, be restored to claimants such as banks or financial institutions.***
- (xi) ***Important Legal Caveat***
- (a) *The figure of **approx. INR 73,000 crore** comes from submissions made by investigating agencies regarding the **aggregate value of bank-loan frauds** under investigation involving group entities.*
 - (b) ***Allegations are still subject to ongoing investigation & judicial proceedings.***
 - (c) ***Registration of FIRs, attachment of assets, or filing of chargesheets does not by itself establish guilt*** final culpability can be determined only through the judicial process



27. What is impact of Haircut in IBC?

- (i) *In an Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC) case, a haircut means the percentage of debt that creditors agree to forgo when a stressed company is resolved, when a lender is owed INR 100 and receives only INR 30, the haircut is 70%.*
- (ii) *Regarding the INR 73,006 crore bank fraud investigation involving companies of the Anil Ambani Group, the figure of INR 73,006 crore refers to the value of loan fraud cases being investigated by the CBI across multiple cases. It is not itself the haircut amount.*
- (iii) **Why are people discussing haircuts in this context?**
- (a) *The ED reportedly informed the Supreme Court that some insolvency proceedings involving entities linked to the group raised concerns about very large reductions in creditor recoveries.*
- (b) *One example cited in court was a claim of about INR 2,983 crore allegedly being settled for around INR 26 crore, implying a recovery of less than 1% and a haircut of over 99%.*
- (c) *These allegations are part of ongoing investigations and judicial scrutiny.*
- (iv) **How is the haircut calculated?**
- **Using the example mentioned above:**
 - (a) *Admitted claim: INR 2,983 crore*
 - (b) *Amount recovered: INR 26 crore*
 - (c) *Recovery rate = $26 \div 2,983 = 0.87\%$*
 - (d) *Haircut rate = $100\% - 0.87\% = 99.13\%$*
 - *That means creditors would have accepted a loss of roughly 99.13% of their admitted claim.*
- (v) **Other Anil Ambani Group insolvency examples**



- **For some group companies, publicly reported IBC resolutions involved substantial haircuts:**

Company	Admitted Claims	Recovery	Approx. Haircut
<i>Reliance Capital</i>	<i>INR 26,086.75 crore admitted</i>	<i>INR 9,661 crore</i>	<i>63% haircut</i>
<i>Reliance Big Private Limited</i>	<i>INR 999 crore</i>	<i>INR 3.5 crore to financial creditors</i>	<i>99% haircut</i>

(vi) **Impact of such haircuts**

- **When creditors accept large haircuts:**
 - Banks recover only a fraction of the loans, affecting profitability and capital.*
 - Public-sector banks ultimately bear losses, which can indirectly affect taxpayers and depositors.*
 - It raises concerns about whether assets were properly valued during insolvency proceedings.*
 - The Supreme Court has expressed concern that some IBC processes may involve undervaluation of assets and excessive haircuts, prompting investigations by the CBI and ED.*

28. Whether money will be recovered?

- **Yes**
- **Whether the alleged INR 73,006 crore bank fraud amount linked to companies of the Anil Ambani Group can be recovered depends primarily on:**
 - Asset Tracing**
 - Identifying and locating assets acquired with the funds or assets belonging to the borrowers, promoters, guarantors, and related entities.*



- (b) *Determining whether those assets are available, legally attachable, and sufficient to satisfy the outstanding liabilities.*
- (ii) **Legal Proceedings**
- (a) *Outcomes of investigations, court cases, insolvency proceedings, debt recovery actions, and enforcement measures by regulators and lenders.*
- (b) *Obtaining attachment, seizure, or recovery orders and successfully enforcing them.*
- (iii) **Additional Factors**
- **Recovery may also depend on:**
 - (a) *The actual value and liquidity of recoverable assets.*
 - (b) *Whether assets have depreciated or are encumbered by other claims.*
 - (c) *Cooperation from borrowers and related parties.*
 - (d) *Cross-border recovery efforts if assets are located outside India.*
 - (e) *The priority of claims among different creditors.*
 - **Therefore, recovery is possible, but the amount ultimately recovered may be less than the total alleged loss, depending on the success of asset tracking and the legal process.**

29. Whether banks are able to recover losses?

- (i) **Partial recovery**
- **Yes**
 - (a) *But recovery is likely to be only partial.*
 - (b) *The amount under investigation relates to multiple loan-fraud cases being probed by the CBI and reviewed by the Supreme Court of India.*
 - (c) *Recovery typically occurs through insolvency proceedings, asset sales, and enforcement actions rather than full repayment.*
- (ii) **Partial recovery through IBC proceedings**



- (a) **Banks can recover part of their dues through the insolvency resolution process under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code (IBC).**
 - (b) **Resolution applicants may acquire distressed assets, and the proceeds are distributed among creditors.**
 - (c) **Historically, recoveries under IBC are often significantly lower than the original loan amounts, resulting in "haircuts" for lenders.**
- (iii) **Partial recovery through seizure and sale of assets**
- (a) **The ED can attach properties, shares, and other assets allegedly linked to the fraud or money laundering.**
 - (b) **Once legal proceedings permit, these assets may be auctioned, and the proceeds can contribute toward repayment of creditors and recovery of public funds.**
 - (c) **Reports indicate that ED has already attached assets worth several thousand crores in related investigations.**

30. What is happening now?

- **Based on publicly reported court filings and agency status reports, the INR 73,006 crore alleged bank-fraud matter involving companies of the Anil Ambani Group is not closed. The case is currently in an active investigation stage.**
- (i) **Actively being investigated**
- (a) **The CBI informed the Supreme Court of India that it is actively investigating seven cases involving alleged bank-loan frauds with aggregate exposure of about INR 73,006 crore.**
 - (b) **CBI has also stated that it is examining the role of certain public servants.**
- (ii) **Actively gathering evidence**
- **Investigative actions reported include:**



- (a) **Examination of loan transactions** and insolvency-related records.
- (b) **Collection and review of documents** by both the CBI and the ED.
- (c) **Investigation into alleged irregularities** connected to insolvency proceedings and related financial arrangements.
- These **activities indicate ongoing evidence collection** rather than a completed investigation.
- (iii) **Actively engaging inter-agency coordination**
 - (a) The **Supreme Court directed** the CBI and ED to **conduct a coordinated, fair, transparent, and time-bound investigation** and sought **cooperation from all relevant institutions**.
 - (b) **Multiple reports indicate that the CBI and ED** submitted status reports and are **pursuing parallel inquiries**.
- (iv) **Bottom line**

Activity	Status
Actively being investigated	Yes
Actively gathering evidence	Yes
Actively engaging inter-agency coordination	Yes

31. What is conclusion till date?

- (i) **No court has yet convicted Anil Ambani** or group of INR 73,000 crore bank fraud.
 - (a) **As of today, the INR 73,000 crore figure** refers to the cumulative value of multiple bank-loan fraud cases **being investigated by the CBI** against companies associated with the Anil Ambani Group.
 - (b) The **matter remains under** investigation and **judicial scrutiny**.
- (ii) **The allegations are serious and have moved beyond mere media speculation.**
 - **Investigating agencies and banks have alleged:**
 - (a) **Diversion of loan funds**



- (b) *Misuse of sanctioned loans*
- (c) *Routing of money through related entities*
- (d) *Circular transactions*
- (e) *Possible violations of banking and lending norms*
- (f) *Suspected money laundering in some cases*
- *These **allegations** are **being examined by the CBI, ED, banks, and other regulators.***
- (iii) ***Some regulatory and banking actions have already occurred.***
 - (a) ***Reliance Communications** and Anil Ambani were **classified as "fraud"** by State Bank of India (SBI) under RBI fraud-management guidelines.*
 - (b) *The **classification** was later **upheld by the Bombay High Court** in litigation challenging SBI's decision.*
- *However, a **bank's "fraud" classification is not the same as a criminal conviction** by a court.*
- (iv) ***Anil Ambani has denied wrongdoing.***
- *He and related entities have **contested several allegations** and legal actions, **arguing** that the **accusations are disputed** and should be tested through due process.*
- (v) ***Conclusion***
 - (a) *The INR 73,000 crore **matter is not yet a proven fraud** in a court of law.*
 - (b) *However, it has **progressed** into multiple active **investigations by the CBI, ED, banks, and regulators**, involving allegations of loan diversion, misuse of funds, and banking irregularities.*
 - (c) *Certain **banks** have **classified** some accounts **as fraud** and courts have upheld parts of those regulatory actions, **but criminal liability** and final responsibility **remain to be determined** through ongoing investigations, court proceedings, and regulatory processes.*



Chapter - II – The Supreme Court's Monitoring

(Source of information: The Hindu updated - April 06, 2026 06:37 pm IST - New Delhi)

32. What are Supreme Court's stands till date?

- (i) **Based on the reports available as on June 2026 that the allegations are under investigations and no court has delivered a final finding that Anil Ambani or ADAG companies committed a INR 73,006 crore bank fraud.**
- (ii) **The Supreme Court has been monitoring aspects of the matter and, in May 2026, indicated that it would for the time being leave the investigation to the CBI and ED while continuing to receive updates.**
- (iii) **The CBI informed the Supreme Court that it was investigating multiple cases involving alleged bank-loan frauds aggregating to approx. INR 73,006 crore.**
- (iv) **The Supreme Court previously directed a fair, transparent, coordinated, and time-bound investigation by the CBI and ED, expressing concern about delays in the probe.**
- (v) **The Supreme Court declined to grant interim relief in a challenge relating to fraud classification of certain loan accounts, allowing the underlying proceedings to continue.**
- (vi) **The ED has reported investigations into alleged fund-diversion and insolvency-related irregularities and has taken attachment actions in connected cases.**

33. What are Supreme Court's initial observations?

- **Based on the Supreme Court's order while reviewing status reports filed by the CBI and the ED in the alleged INR 73,006 crore bank fraud investigations concerning the RAAG, the Court made the following initial observations:**
 - (i) **"The preliminary facts speak for themselves."**
The Supreme Court observed that the **material placed before it** was sufficiently **significant** to warrant **a thorough** and coordinated **investigation**.



- (ii) **Investigating agencies must work together to uncover all irregularities and possible collusion.**
- **The Supreme Court stated that senior officials of the CBI and ED should collaborate and make a strong effort to uncover any irregularities, illegal acts, or collusion and connivance involving public officials.**
- (iii) **The role of public officials in financial institutions must be examined.**
- **The Supreme Court specifically observed that investigators should look into whether public officials, particularly those in financial institutions, granted any "undue benefits" to the management of RAAG and determine whether there was any collusion or misconduct.**
- (iv) **The Supreme Court also clarified that it was not expressing any opinion on the merits of the allegations, but directed that the investigation be conducted in a fair, transparent, independent, and time-bound manner.**

34. What are Supreme Court's further observations?

- (i) **The Supreme Court stated:**
- **"While we do not express any opinion on the merits of the allegations..." and emphasized that the investigation must proceed independently and fairly.**
- (ii) **It further observed that:**
- **"...it is imperative upon the CBI and the ED to complete the investigation in a most dispassionate, fair, transparent and independent manner and take the ongoing investigation to its logical conclusion in a time-bound manner."**
- (iii) **In addition, the Court noted that:**
- (a) **The preliminary facts disclosed in the status reports warranted a thorough probe.**
- (b) **Senior officials of the investigating agencies should collaborate to uncover any irregularities, illegalities, collusion, or connivance by public**



officials, particularly those connected with financial institutions, if such conduct is found.

- (c) *All agencies and financial institutions were directed to extend full cooperation to the ED by providing necessary information in a timely manner.*

35. What is matter informed by ED to the Supreme Court?

- (i) *The ED informed the three-judge Supreme Court bench led by Surya Kant that it had not yet received certain information requested from other investigating and regulatory agencies (sister probe agencies) that was needed for its ongoing money-laundering investigation.*
- (ii) *The Supreme Court directed:*
- (a) *All agencies and financial institutions to provide full cooperation to the ED.*
- (b) *The requested information to be supplied promptly.*
- (c) *The CBI and ED to coordinate closely and complete their investigations in a fair, transparent, and time-bound manner.*
- (iv) *The Supreme court also noted concerns that the preliminary material suggested possible irregularities and potential collusion by officials involved in granting benefits to ADAG entities, and emphasized that investigators should examine those aspects thoroughly.*
- (v) (a) *It is important to note that these are allegations under investigation.*
- (b) *The Supreme Court has expressly stated that it has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the allegations, and no final judicial finding of guilt has been made*

36. What is Supreme Court's directive?

- *The Supreme Court directed that:*
- (i) *The ED and CBI must conduct a fair, dispassionate, transparent, independent, and time-bound investigation.*



- (ii) *All government agencies and financial institutions **must provide their full cooperation to the ED** and make requested information available **promptly**.*
- (iii) *The investigative **agencies should work together** and take the ongoing probe **to its logical conclusion**.*
- (iv) *The **Supreme Court emphasized the need to uncover** any possible involvement or **connivance of public officials** if supported by evidence.*



Chapter - III – Investigation by ED

(Source of information: The Hindu updated - April 06, 2026 06:37 pm IST - New Delhi)

37. What is reported by ED to the Supreme Court?

- (i) The ED stated **it seized** “certain” documents relating to a **purported** “Project Help”, suggesting **IBC proceedings** were allegedly **initiated through unrelated lenders** in a “deliberate” manner.
- (ii) The ED **reported that** funding for **IBC acquisitions** was allegedly **routed through** a group of **8 NBFCs**, where **claims of** about **INR 2,983 crore** were **settled for** only **INR 26 crore**.
- (iii) The ED **informed** the Supreme Court **that it has formed** a Special Investigation Team (**SIT**) **and is handling** around **8 related cases** linked to RAAG.



Chapter - IV – Investigation by CBI

(Source of information: The Hindu updated - April 06, 2026 06:37 pm IST - New Delhi)

38. What are Investigations by CBI?

(i) **The CBI is actually investigating:**

- (a) The **CBI** has **registered** multiple **FIRs** (commonly reported as around 7 cases) **against entities** linked to the Reliance Anil Ambani Group.
- (b) These cases **relate to** allegations of large-scale **bank loan fraud**, including:
- **Diversion** of bank funds
 - Alleged **misrepresentation** of accounts
 - Suspected **misuse** of loans sanctioned by public sector banks
 - Non-performing asset (**NPA**) **classification** disputes

(ii) **The Supreme Court's involvement:**

- (a) The Supreme Court is **directly and continuously** “monitoring” this specific **CBI investigation** in the manner implied.
- (b) **CBI investigations proceed under** the supervision of **jurisdictional courts** (magistrate/special courts), **unless** a specific case is explicitly **taken up for monitoring directions**.

39. What are informed by CBI to the Supreme Court?

- (i) (a) The CBI stated that it is actively **investigating 7** separate **cases** arising from the broader allegations **of large-scale loan fraud and diversion of funds**.
- (b) The CBI also told the Supreme court **that the probe is not limited** to corporate entities, **but is examining** the **role of** “certain public servants”, suggesting scrutiny of possible **involvement** or collusion **by officials in** the sanctioning or **handling of loans**.
- (ii) The CBI also submitted that it is **conducting the investigation in coordination with the ED**, meaning the criminal investigation by CBI and money-laundering/asset-tracing probe by ED are **running in parallel**, with financial trail **analysis being shared** between the two agencies.



Chapter - V – Provisional attachments and arrest the executives by ED

40. What is INR 3034.90 crore provisionally attachment?

(Source of information: ED's Press Release dated April 28, 2026)

- The INR 3,034.90 crore “provisionally attached” in the Anil Ambani Group-linked **bank fraud case** refers to **assets that the ED has “temporarily frozen” under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA), 2002** because they are **suspected to be** connected to Proceeds of Crime (PoC) like:
 - (i) **What “provisionally attached” means?**
 - **Under Section 5 of the PMLA, the ED can:**
 - (a) “Temporarily freeze” or **attach properties/assets** i.e. **bank accounts, land, shares, flats, etc.**
 - (b) **It believes** they are **linked to** money laundering or **fraud**
 - (c) Even “before” **a court conviction**
 - **Hence, this is not a final confiscation—it is a preventive freeze.**
 - (ii) **What the INR 3,034.90 crore represents?**
 - (a) This amount refers to the **value of additional assets** recently **attached in the case of** involving Reliance Communications (**RCOM**) Ltd.
 - (b) These are **added to earlier attachments**, taking the **total attached assets** to about INR **19,344 crore** in the broader investigation.
 - (iii) **Why ED is doing this?**
 - **The ED's stated purpose is to:**
 - (a) **Prevent assets from being sold**, transferred, or hidden
 - (b) **Ensure that if fraud is proven, money can be recovered** for lenders (banks)
 - (c) **Preserve value** for eventual restitution to **victims** i.e. public sector banks, LIC, etc.



(iv) **What the broader case is about?**

- **The investigation is linked to allegations** that companies in the Anil Ambani group, including Reliance Communications, **allegedly**:
 - (a) Took large **loans from banks**
 - (b) Diverted or **misused funds**
 - (c) **Left loans as Non-Performing Assets (NPAs)**
 - (d) Resulted in **alleged losses to institutions** i.e. SBI, PNB, BoB, and LIC
- **Anil Ambani is not accused of conviction at this stage; the matter is still under investigation.**

(v) **Important legal point**

- **Even after attachment:**
 - (a) **Ownership does not immediately transfer**
 - (b) The **assets remain frozen until:**
 - **Court proceedings conclude, and**
 - **A PMLA special court decides whether they are PoC**

41. What is arrest of Amitabh Jhunjunwala and Amit Bapna?

(Source of information: The Week Magazine dated April 15, 2026)

- This refers to a **high-profile ED action under PMLA, 2002** in an alleged large-scale bank loan fraud linked to companies associated with the Anil Ambani group.
- (i) **What was happened?**
 - On or around **15 April 2026**, the ED reportedly arrested former senior executives **Amitabh Jhunjunwala and Amit Bapna** in connection with an ongoing investigation into an alleged **INR 73,006 crore bank fraud and money-laundering case** involving companies of the Reliance Anil Ambani Group (RAAG).



(ii) **Who were arrested?**

(a) **Amitabh Jhunjhunwala:** Former Vice Chairman and Director of Reliance Capital Ltd also associated with its financial arms:

- Reliance Home Finance Limited (**RHFL**)
- Reliance Commercial Finance Ltd (**RCFL**)
- Considered a **close aide in the Anil Ambani business ecosystem.**

(b) **Amit Bapna:** Former director associated with RHFL

(iii) **What the case is about?**

- **The ED's allegations are based on FIRs filed earlier by the CBI involve:**

(a) Large bank loans allegedly **routed through multiple group companies**

(b) **Accusations that funds were:**

- **Diverted**
- **Layered through transactions**
- **Possibly moved using shell or dummy entities**

(c) Estimated **exposure of around INR 73,006 crore**

- **The investigation is being carried out under the PMLA, 2002, which allows the ED to arrest individuals, attach assets, and seek custodial interrogation in ED's Special court.**

(iv) **Why they were arrested?**

- **According to description and standard ED procedure:**

(a) They were **questioned first and then taken into custody**

(b) ED claims **custodial interrogation is needed to:**

- **Trace money flows**
- **Identify beneficiary entities**
- **Understand decision-making in loan disbursement and diversion**

(c) They were then **produced before a court, where ED sought custody for further questioning**



(v) **What is broader context?**

- (a) **The case is part of a wider probe into alleged financial irregularities in companies linked to the Anil Ambani Group**
- (b) **It focuses mainly on loan defaults, alleged diversion of funds, and restructuring of debt across group companies**

(vi) **What is Important note?**

- **At this stage, this is an investigation and allegation stage, not a conviction. The court process will determine:**
 - (a) **Whether the arrests and claims are legally sustained**
 - (b) **Whether charges lead to prosecution or discharge**

42. What is INR 581.65 crore provisionally attachment?

(Source of information: ED's Press Release dated March 12, 2026)

- (i) **The INR 581.65 crore “provisional attachment” is not the total alleged fraud amount. It is the latest tranche of assets that the ED has “temporarily attached” under the PMLA, 2002 as part of its investigation into alleged fund diversion and bank fraud involving Reliance Home Finance Limited (RHFL) and Reliance Commercial Finance Limited (RCFL) both associated with the Reliance Anil Ambani Group (RAAG).**

- (a) **Haryana**
- (b) **Jharkhand**
- (c) **Maharashtra**
- (d) **Delhi**
- (e) **West Bengal**
- (f) **Andhra Pradesh**
- (g) **Rajasthan**

(ii) **What is part of the PoC?**

- (a) **Reliance Power Limited (RPL)**
- (b) **Reliance Communications Limited (RCL)**



- (c) Reliance Capital Limited (RCL)
- (d) The **diversion** allegedly occurred **through** numerous **shell** or dummy **entities with little or no genuine business activity**.
- (e) **Investigators claim they uncovered a mechanism used to siphon funds from RHFL and RCFL were seized under Section 37A of FEMA, 1999 special courts, and any appeals.**
- **Further investigation remains ongoing.**

43. What is Pali Hill Residential property's provisional attachment?

(Source of information: ED's Press Release dated Feb 25, 2026)

- The provisional **attachment of the Pali Hill residential property "Abode" forms part of a larger money-laundering investigation** linked to alleged bank fraud **involving Reliance Communications Ltd. (RCOM) and entities of the Reliance Anil Ambani Group (RAAG).**
- (i) **What are the Key facts regarding the attachment?**
 - (a) The **ED's Special Task Force (STF) provisionally attached "Abode", the Pali Hill residential property** associated with Anil Ambani, with a **valuation of INR 3,716.83 crore under the provisions of the PMLA, 2002. Earlier, a portion of the same property worth INR 473.17 crore had already been attached.**
 - (b) Following this action, the **cumulative value of assets attached by the ED in cases involving the Reliance Anil Ambani Group exceeded INR 15,700 crore as of February 25, 2026.**
 - (c) The **investigation originates from a CBI FIR alleging offences including criminal conspiracy, cheating, criminal breach of trust, and corruption against RCOM, Anil Ambani, and others.**
 - (d) **According to the ED, RCOM and related group companies obtained loans from domestic and foreign lenders, with outstanding dues of approximately INR 40,185 crore.**



(ii) Why the property was attached?

- **The ED alleges that the Pali Hill property was transferred into RiseE Trust, described as a private family trust of members of Anil Ambani's family. According to the agency, this restructuring was intended to:**
 - (a) Create the appearance that Anil Ambani was not directly connected with the asset.**
 - (b) Preserve family wealth and generate resources through the trust structure.**
 - (c) Shield the property from liabilities arising from personal guarantees allegedly provided by Anil Ambani to banks for RCOM loans.**
 - (d) Ensure continued beneficial ownership and use by family members rather than making the asset available to lenders whose loans had become non-performing assets (NPAs).**

(iii) What is relation to the INR 73,006 crore bank fraud case?

- (a) The attachment of "Abode" is one enforcement action within the broader investigation into alleged fraud and diversion of funds involving the Reliance Anil Ambani Group.**
- (b) The specific ED attachment order concerns the RCOM-linked money-laundering probe and adds INR 3,716.83 crore to the assets attached in the group, bringing the cumulative attached value to more than INR 15,700 crore as of February 2026.**
 - **Further investigation remains ongoing.**

44. What is INR 1,885 crore provisionally attachment?*(Source of information: ED's Press Release dated Jan 28, 2026)***(i) What does "INR 1,885 crore provisional attachment" mean?**

- **The ED has reportedly issued 4 separate "Provisional Attachment" Orders (PAOs) covering assets worth approx. INR 1,885 crore, including:**



- (a) **Bank balances**
- (b) **Receivables** (amounts due to be received)
- (c) **Shareholdings** in unlisted companies
- (d) **Immovable properties**
- **These attachments relate to investigations involving:**
 - (a) **Reliance Home Finance Limited (RHFL)**
 - (b) **Reliance Commercial Finance Limited (RCFL)**
 - (c) **Reliance Communications Limited (RCL)**
 - (d) **Transactions involving Yes Bank**
- (ii) **Which assets have reportedly been attached?**
 - (a) **Shareholdings in infrastructure and utility businesses** held by Reliance Infrastructure Limited (RIL) in:
 - **BSES Yamuna Power Limited (BYPL)**
 - **BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (BRPL)**
 - **Mumbai Metro One Private Limited (MMOPL)**
 - (b) **Financial assets**
 - **Assets associated with Value Infracon India Private Limited (VI IPL):**
 - **Bank balances** of approx. INR 148 crore
 - **Receivables** of approx. INR 143 crore
 - (c) **Other assets**
 - **A residential property** allegedly held in the name of **Angarai Sethuraman**.
 - **Shares and mutual fund** investments allegedly held in the name of the **wife of Puneet Garg**, described as a senior employee of the Reliance Anil Ambani Group.
- (iii) **Why is the total attachment figure shown as INR 12,002 crore?**
 - (a) **Earlier ED attachments: INR 10,117 crore**
 - (b) **New ED attachments: INR 1,885 crore**



(iv) **What is the alleged fraud mechanism?**

(a) **Loans and public funds were raised through companies like:**

- *Reliance Communications Limited (RCL)*
- *Reliance Home Finance Limited (RHFL)*
- *Reliance Commercial Finance Limited (RCFL)*

(b) **Funds were allegedly:**

- *Diverted to related parties.*
- *Used to repay loans of other group entities.*
- *Routed through interconnected transactions.*
- *Used for alleged "evergreening" of loans i.e. using fresh funds to service existing debt.*

(c) **The ED alleges that:**

- *RCOM group entities borrowed extensively from domestic and foreign lenders.*
- *Approx. INR 13,600 crore was diverted, including around INR 12,600 crore to connected parties and INR 1,800 crore into deposits and mutual funds.*
- *Certain funds may have been moved abroad through outward remittances.*

(v) **What is the Yes Bank aspect?**

(a) **Yes, Bank invested about:**

- *INR 2,965 crore in RHFL instruments.*
- *INR 2,045 crore in RCFL instruments.*

(b) **These exposures later became non-performing assets (NPAs), with significant outstanding balances.**

- *The ED also appears to be examining whether funds originating from Reliance Nippon Life Asset Management (RNLAM) reached to RHFL and RCFL*



indirectly **through** transactions **involving Yes Bank**, allegedly circumventing conflict-of-interest restrictions, **these are allegations under investigation** and would ultimately **need to be established** through evidence and legal proceedings.

(vi) **What is important legal point?**

- (a) A “provisional attachment” **does not establish guilt**. It means the **ED believes the assets** represent or are **connected to alleged PoC** and wants **to preserve them during the investigation**.
- (b) The attachment must undergo **further legal scrutiny** “before” any **final confiscation** can occur.
- (c) The **allegations** against Anil Ambani and the related entities **remain subject to investigation**, adjudication, and any **subsequent court proceedings**.

45. **What is INR 1,120 crore provisionally attachment?**

(Source of information: ED's Press Release dated Dec 05, 2025)

(i) **What does "provisional attachment of INR 1,120 crore" mean?**

- A “provisional attachment” is **a temporary legal freezing of assets**, the **owners cannot sell**, transfer, mortgage, or otherwise **dispose** of those assets **while the investigation** and adjudication process **continues**, the ED has **attached assets** worth approx. **INR 1,120 crore** like:
 - (a) **More than 18 immovable properties**
 - (b) **Fixed deposits**
 - (c) **Bank balances**
 - (d) **Shareholdings in unquoted companies**
- **The attachment is part of an investigation into alleged fraud involving:**
 - (a) **Reliance Home Finance Limited (RHFL)**
 - (b) **Reliance Commercial Finance Limited (RCFL)**
 - (c) **Yes Bank**



- **The ED stated that these newly attached assets include:**
 - (a) **7 properties of Reliance Infrastructure Limited (RIL)**
 - (b) **2 properties of Reliance Power Limited (RPL)**
 - (c) **9 properties of Reliance Value Services Pvt. Ltd. (RVSPL)**
 - (d) **Fixed deposits and investments held through several group-linked entities.**

- (ii) **Why is this significant?**
 - (a) **Earlier attachments in related bank-fraud cases total approx. INR 8,997 crore.**
 - (b) **The new attachment approx. INR 1,120 crore increases total attached assets to approx. INR 10,117 crore.**

- (iii) **What is the INR 73,006 crore figure?**
 - (a) **The INR 73,006 crore figure refers to the broader alleged fraud, loan defaults, fund diversion, and financial irregularities being investigated across multiple Reliance Group entities and lenders.**
 - (b) **It is not the value of the assets attached.**
 - (c) **The ED's attachment of INR 10,117 crore represents only the assets it has currently identified and frozen as alleged "PoC" or assets linked to the alleged offenses.**

- (iv) **What is attachment mean guilt has been proven?**

No.

- **A provisional attachment:**
 - (a) **Is an investigative and preventive measure.**
 - (b) **Does not amount to a conviction.**
 - (c) **Must be confirmed through the legal process under PMLA, 2002.**
 - (d) **Can be challenged before the appropriate adjudicating authority and courts.**



46. What is INR 1,452 crore provisionally attachment?

(Source of information: ED's Press Release dated Nov 11, 2025)

(i) What is "provisional attachment" of INR 1,452.51 crore?

- (a) A "provisional attachment" under the PMLA, 2002 where the ED temporarily freezes or seizes control over specified properties so that they cannot be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of during the investigation and adjudication process continues.
- (b) It is not a final confiscation and does not by itself establish guilt.
- (c) The attachment must be confirmed through the statutory process under PMLA 2002.
- (d) The newly attached assets include buildings in the DAKC and Millennium Business Park in Navi Mumbai and land/buildings in Pune, Chennai, and Bhubaneswar, valued at INR 1,452.51 crore.

(ii) How this is related to the INR 73,006 crore bank fraud case?

- (a) The figure INR 73,006 crore generally refers to the broader alleged bank-loan exposure/fraud investigation involving various Reliance Group entities and lenders.
- (b) The ED's attachment value is not the same as the alleged fraud amount like:

Item	Amount
Alleged bank fraud / loan exposure under investigation	INR 73,006 crore
Fresh ED attachment	INR 1,452.51 crore
Earlier ED attachments	INR 7,545 crore
Total attachments (up to date)	INR 9,000 crore

(iii) What is important legal distinction?

- (a) The ED's action is an investigative and preventive measure.



- (b) The **attachment** of assets does **not** by itself **amount to a judicial finding** that fraud or money laundering has been proven.
- (c) **Final** determination **depends on** ongoing **proceedings before** the relevant authorities and **courts**.

47. What is INR 3,083 crore provisionally attachment?

(Source of information: ED's Press Release dated Nov 03, 2025)

(i) **What is the INR 3,083 crore provisional attachment?**

(a) The **ED** under Section **5(1)** of the **PMLA 2002**, "provisionally **attached**" assets worth approx. **INR 3,083 crore** that it believes are **linked to PoC** arising **from** an alleged **INR 73,006 crore** bank-loan **fraud** and **diversion of public funds**.

(b) **Properties attached**

The **attachment** covered more than **42 properties** belonging to companies associated with the **Reliance Anil Ambani Group (RAAG)**, including entities like:

- **30 properties** of **Reliance Infrastructure Limited (RIL)**
- **5 properties** of **Adhar Property Consultancy Private Limited (APCPL)**
- **4 properties** of **Mohanbir Hi-tech Build Private Limited (MHTBPL)**
- **1 property** of **Gamesa Investment Management Private Limited (GIMPL)**
- **1 property** of **Vihaan 43 Realty Private Limited** (earlier known as **M/s Kunj Bihari Developers Private Limited**)
- **1 property** of **Campion Properties Limited (CPL)**

(c) **Details of major properties attached**

- The **Pali Hill residence** in **Bandra (West), Mumbai**
- **Reliance Centre** on **Maharaja Ranjit Singh Road, New Delhi**
- **Other properties** located in **Delhi, Noida, Ghaziabad, Mumbai, Pune, Thane, Hyderabad, Chennai, Kancheepuram, and East Godavari**



(ii) **What did the ED allege?**

- The ED alleges that “certain” **companies have obtained borrowings from more than 35 banks and financial institutions**, after which **large portions** of the funds were allegedly **diverted rather than used for their stated purposes** like:

- (a) **Reliance Communications Limited (RCL)**
- (b) **Reliance Home Finance Limited (RHFL)**
- (c) **Reliance Commercial Finance Limited (RCFL)**
- (d) **Reliance Infrastructure Limited (RIL)**
- (e) **Reliance Power Limited (RPL)**

(iii) **What are Key findings alleged by the ED?**

(a) **Diversion of loan funds**

- **Loans routed through multiple entities and shell companies.**
- **Funds transferred rapidly between accounts.**
- **Corporate loans allegedly used to move public money to related entities**

(b) **Breakdown of lending controls**

- **Loans disbursed before sanction approvals.**
- **Same-day application, approval, documentation and disbursal.**
- **Sanctions issued before borrower applications were submitted.**
- **Undated credit approvals.**

(c) **Missing due diligence**

- **Waiver of field investigations.**
- **Waiver of Personal Discussions (PDs).**
- **Absence of proper valuations and technical checks.**
- **Lack of escrow arrangements and security creation.**

(d) **Questionable borrowers**

- **Some borrowers reportedly had little or no business activity, employees, assets, or revenue.**
- **Certain entities allegedly existed mainly to receive and route funds.**



(e) **Layering and round-tripping**

- **Funds allegedly moved through interconnected companies before reaching group entities.**

(f) **Auditor and regulatory concerns**

- **Regulatory action by the National Housing Bank (NHB).**
- **Actions by Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI).**
- **Auditor resignations and fraud reporting under Section 143(12) of the Companies Act (CA), 2013.**
- **Penalties by the National Financial Reporting Authority (NFRA).**

(iv) **What are additional FEMA findings?**

(a) **The ED also reportedly conducted a separate investigation under the Foreign Exchange Management Act (FEMA), 1999 involving Reliance Infrastructure Limited and alleged that approx. INR 40 crore was siphoned from the Jaipur–Reengus highway project and routed through shell entities to Dubai.**

(b) **The ED claims this led to the discovery of a wider international hawala network more than INR 600 crore.**



Chapter - VI – Investigations and arrest the executives by CBI

48. What are searches in RAAG Cases at 7 Locations?

(Source of information: CBI's Press Release dated May 14, 2026)

- The **CBI** conducted **searches on May 14 2026** as part of its investigation **into alleged financial fraud involving Reliance Communications (RCOM) Ltd.**, a company belonging to the RAAG, the searches **covered 7 locations in Mumbai, Gurugram, and Bengaluru.**
- (i) **What are the searches at former executives' residences?**
 - (a) The searches **targeted the residences of the company's former CEO, CFO, and directors who served between 2015 and 2017.**
 - (b) The searches were authorized by **warrants issued by the Special Judge for CBI Cases in Mumbai.**
- (ii) **What are evidences seized?**
 - (a) The CBI searches resulted in the **seizure of "incriminating documents."**
 - (b) The **investigation remains ongoing.**
- (iii) **What are the broader fraud investigations?**
 - (a) The **CBI has registered 7 cases against companies within the Anil Ambani-led group based on complaints from Public Sector Banks (PSBs) and Life Insurance Corporation (LIC) of India.**
 - (b) The CBI alleges a combined **loss of INR 27,337 crore to these banks and institutions.**
- (iv) **What were previous searches and arrests?**
 - (a) The CBI had already **searched 31 locations in related cases.**
 - (b) **2 former Reliance Communications (RCOM) Ltd. executives, D. Vishwanath and Anil Kalya, were arrested on April 20, 2026 and were reported to be in judicial custody.**



(v) **What is Supreme Court oversight?**

- The CBI stated that the **investigations** into the RAAG related cases is **being monitored by the Supreme Court of India.**

(vi) **What is legal status of searches and arrests by CBI?**

- (a) The **searches, arrests, and registration of cases indicate that the CBI believes there is sufficient basis to investigate** alleged fraud.
- (b) These **actions do not by themselves establish guilt.**
- (c) Any **criminal liability** would ultimately **depend on evidence presented and findings made by the courts.**

49. What are searches in RAAG Cases at 17 Locations?

(Source of information: CBI's Press Release dated May 09, 2026)

- This appears to be a **press-release-style summary** of an investigation by India's CBI **involving companies associated with the RAAG.**
- (i) **What are Key points?**
- (a) The CBI conducted **searches on May 09 2026 at 17 locations in Mumbai linked to 3 companies:**
- **Reliance Telecom Ltd. (RTL)**
 - **Reliance Commercial Finance Ltd. (RCFL)**
 - **Reliance Home Finance Ltd. (RHFL)**
- (b) **The searches targeted:**
- **Residential premises of directors** of these companies.
 - **Offices of intermediary companies allegedly used to divert bank funds**
- (c) The searches were conducted under **warrants issued by a special CBI court in Mumbai on May 08, 2026.**
- (d) According to the statement, investigators **seized documents** considered relevant to the case and **found that** several intermediary **companies** were **operating from same address, which may be significant to investigation.**

(ii) What are allegations?

- The **CBI** says it has **registered 7 cases** against companies in the RAAG based on complaints from:
 - (a) Various Public Sector Banks (**PSBs**)
 - (b) Life Insurance Corporation of India (**LIC**)
- The allegations concern **frauds involving loans** and financial transactions. The **CBI states that the total alleged loss** across these cases is approx. **INR 27,337 cr.**

(iii) Who were arrested?

- The statement says that **on April 20, 2026, two former senior executives associated with Reliance Communications (RCOM) Ltd. were arrested:**
 - (a) D. Vishwanath
 - (b) Anil Kalya
- The CBI alleges **they were involved in** managing banking operations and **utilization of funds.** The statement says they **remain in judicial custody**

(iv) What is Important context?

- (a) These are allegations under investigation, **not findings of guilt.** Searches, **arrests,** and registration of cases **are investigative steps.** Any **criminal liability** of the companies or individuals **involved** would ultimately be determined through the **judicial process.**
- (b) The statement also notes that the **investigation** is being **monitored by the Supreme Court of India.**

50. What is arrest of D Vishwanath and Anil Kalya?

(Source of information: CBI's Press Release dated April 20, 2026)

- Based on the information released by the **CBI,** the **arrests of D. Vishwanath and Anil Kalya** are part of an ongoing investigation **into alleged bank fraud** involving Reliance Communications Limited, a company **associated with the Reliance ADA Group.**



(i) **What are Key Allegations?**

- (a) *The **CBI registered a case** against Reliance Communications Ltd., Anil D. Ambani, and others **following a complaint from** State Bank of India (SBI).*
- (b) *The **SBI alleged** that it **suffered** a wrongful loss of **approx. INR 2,929.05 crore** due to fraudulent activities **connected with** credit **facilities** granted **to the company**.*
- (c) *The **SBI complaint**, the total alleged wrongful loss to a **consortium of 17 Public Sector Banks (PSBs)** and financial **institutions** amounted to approx. **INR 19,694.33 crore**.*
- (d) *The **CBI alleges that** Reliance Communications **conducted circuitous transactions through shell entities** controlled by company officials and **used discounted** letters of credit (LCs) for allegedly **bogus service transactions** with group entities, these **transactions** allegedly **resulted** in significant **losses to lenders**.*

(ii) **What is role Attributed to the Arrested Executives?**

- (a) ***D. Vishwanath**, Joint President of RCom, was allegedly **in charge of** the group's **banking operations**.*
- (b) *The **CBI claim** that fund **misutilization** occurred **under his directions** and that he **coordinated** with banks **regarding** sanction and **disbursal of facilities**.*
- (c) ***Anil Kalya**, Vice President, allegedly **assisted Vishwanath** and was **involved in** corporate finance, banking operations, **payments**, and fund **utilization activities**.*
- (d) *Both executives were **arrested** and **produced before** the jurisdictional **court**.*
- (e) *The **CBI statements indicated** that **they** were **remanded** to judicial custody **during the investigation** continued.*



(iii) **What is “INR73,006 Crore” Figure?**

- **The CBI press releases and publicly reported arrest documents concerning Vishwanath and Kalya refer to:**
 - (a) **INR 2,929.05 crore alleged loss to SBI**
 - (b) **INR 19,694.33 crore alleged loss to 17 banks/FIs**
 - (c) **INR 73,006 crore does not appear in the arrest announcement itself.**
 - (d) **It may refer to a broader aggregation of alleged financial irregularities, debts, or multiple investigations involving various group companies, but the arrest-related allegations cited by the CBI focus on the amounts noted above.**
 - (e) **The CBI has also stated that it registered 7 cases against companies of the Anil Ambani-led group involving alleged losses running into thousands of crores.**

51. What is Chargesheet dated Sep 18, 25 for frauds by RAAG Companies?*(Source of information: CBI's Press Release dated Sep 18, 2025)*

- (i) **The CBI chargesheets filed on Sep 18, 2025 in connection with alleged transactions involving companies of the RAAG, Yes Bank, and entities linked to former Yes Bank CEO Rana Kapoor and his family.**
- (ii) **The chargesheets were filed before a special court in Mumbai, CBI chargesheets themselves were centered on the alleged INR 2,796.77 crore loss to Yes Bank where Yes Bank invested approx. INR 2,045 crore in debentures and commercial debt instruments of.**
 - (a) **Yes, Bank also invested approx. INR 2,965 crore in debentures and commercial papers of Reliance Home Finance Limited (RHFL).**
 - (b) **These investments were approved during the tenure of Rana Kapoor despite concerns regarding the financial condition of the companies. reportedly named:**



- *Rana Kapoor*
- *Bindu Kapoor*
- *Radha Kapoor*
- *Roshni Kapoor*
- *Reliance Commercial Finance Ltd (RCFL)*
- *Reliance Home Finance Limited (RHFL)*
- *RAB Enterprises Private Limited (REPL)*
- *Imagine Estate Private Limited (IEPL)*
- *Bliss House Private Limited (BHPL)*
- *Imagine Habitat Private Limited (IHPL)*
- *Imagine Residence Private Limited (IRPL)*
- *Morgan Credits Private Limited (MCPL)*

(iii) These **transactions/investments** were **cited by the CBI** as part of the broader alleged **quid-pro-quo arrangement, linked to Rana Kapoor's family**, the allegations remain **subject to adjudication by the court** like:

- (a) **Investments** in Morgan Credits debentures
- (b) **Purchases** of certain RAAG company debentures from Yes Bank
- (c) **Investments** in Yes Bank AT1 bonds.



Published By



CA. Satish Agarwal

B.com (Hons.) FCA

Practicing Chartered Accountant Since 1985

+919811081957

9/14 (First Floor) East Patel Nagar, New Delhi- 110008

Email: satishagarwal307@yahoo.com

Website: www.femainindia.com

◆ *Disclaimer*

- 1. Contents of this Research book are solely for informational purpose (only). Neither this Research book nor information's contained herein constitutes a contract or will form basis of a contract.***
- 2. Material contained in this Research book does not constitute or substitute professional advice may be required before acting on any matter.***
- 3. Every care has been taken in preparation of this Research book to ensure its accuracy at time of publication.***
- 4. Satish Agarwal assumes no responsibility for any error which despite all precautions may be found herein.***
- 5. We shall not be liable for direct, indirect or consequential damages if any arising out of or in any way connected with use of this Research book or information's contained herein.***

June-2026