APHC010441902026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3521]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE 16th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 7342/2026

Between:

1. PAPANNAGARI LAVANYA, W/PO. PAPANNAGARI MRUTHI PRASAD AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS, OCC EX-SARPANCH,R/O. 43-UDEHOLAM VILLAGE, KANEKAL MANDAL,ANANTHAPURAMU DISTRICT.
2. PV MARHUTHI PRASAD, S/O.DEVENDRAPPA,AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS, R/O. 43-UDEHOLAM VILLAGE,KANEKAL MANDAL, ANANTHAPURAMU DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, THROUGH SHO, KANEKAL POLICE STATION,REP. BY ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATHI GUNTUR DISTRICT.
2. BOYA ANJANAMMA, D/O. MOKA ANJINEYULU, AGE 40 YEARS, R/O. UDEGOLAM VILLAGE, KANEKAL MANDAL, ANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT. RESPONDENT NO.2 IS IMPLEADED AS PER THE COURT ORDER DATED 01.09.2026 IN CRL.P.NO.7342 OF 2026.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused(S):

1. N RANGA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant(S):

1. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

2.M RAVIKANTH REDDY

The Court made the following:
ORDER:

Criminal Petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNSS') by the Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 2 for granting of pre-arrest bail in connection with Crime No.84 of 2026 of Kanekal Police Station, Ananthapuram District, was registered for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 133 and 351(2) read with 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNS').

2. Mr. N. Ranga Reddy, the learned counsel for the Petitioners, contends that the Petitioners are innocent of the alleged offences and have been falsely implicated by the police. It is further submitted that the Petitioners are the sole earning members of their respective families and, therefore, their arrest would cause undue hardship to their dependents. The Petitioners undertake to strictly adhere to any conditions that may be imposed by this Court while granting pre-arrest bail. Hence, it is urged to allow the Criminal Petition.

3. *Per contra,* Mr. A. Sai Rohith, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, vehemently opposed the grant of pre-arrest bail to the Petitioners, submitting that the investigation is still underway and several material witnesses remain to be examined. It is contended that if the Petitioners are granted pre-arrest bail, there is a strong likelihood that they may abscond, thereby hampering the ongoing investigation and evading the process of law. Hence, it is urged to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the Petitioners and the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor. Perused the record.

5. On perusal of the record, it appears that the investigation was completed after examining fourteen witnesses, and the charge sheet was filed. The husband of Respondent No.2 died six days after the alleged suicide attempt. Accused No.1/Petitioner No.1 is a former Sarpanch.

6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the gravity and nature of the allegations levelled against the Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 2, this Court is inclined to enlarge the Petitioners on pre-arrest bail with some stringent conditions.

7. In the result, the Criminal Petition is allowed with the following conditions:

> i. In the event of their arrest, the Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 2 shall be enlarged on bail subject to their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only) each with two sureties each for the like sum each to the satisfaction of the arresting police officials;
>
> ii. The Petitioners/ Accused Nos.1 and 2 shall make themselves available for investigation as and when required;
>
> iii. The Petitioners/ Accused Nos.1 and 2 shall not cause any threat, inducement or promise to the prosecution witnesses.
>
> iv. The Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 2 shall appear before the learned Trial Court on each and every date of adjournment.

v. The Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 2 shall not leave the limits of the State of Andhra Pradesh without the express permission from the Station House Officer concerned.

vi. The Petitioners/ Accused Nos.1 and 2 shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court.

vii. The Petitioners/ Accused Nos.1 and 2 shall surrender their passports, if any, to the Investigating Officer. If they claim that they do not have passports, they shall submit affidavits to that effect to the Investigating Officer.

_____

DR. Y. LAKSHMANA RAO, J

Date: 16.10.2026
KMS

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 7342 of 2026

Date: 16.10.2026

KMS