APHC010538372026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

[3521]

THURSDAY, THE 15th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 9010/2026

Between:

1. RELANGI SRINU, S/O SATYANARAYANA,AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS, R/O D. NO. 7-53, VINAYAKA TEMPLE,RAGHUNATHAPURAM, RAJANAGARAM MANDAL EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT - 533296.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, Rep. By its Public Prosecutor,High Court of Andhra Pradesh, at Amaravati,Through Prohibition Excise Station, Rajahmundry South,Police Station, East Godavari District.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused:

1. SUNNI MUNEER BASHA

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant:

1. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The Criminal Petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity, 'the BNSS') by the petitioner /accused, seeking grant of pre-arrest bail in connection with Crime No.414 of 2025 of Prohibition and Excise Police Station, Rajamahendravaram South, registered for the alleged offences punishable under Section 7-B read with 8-A and 8-B of the Andhra Pradesh Prohibition (Amendment) Act, 2020.

2. Mr. Sunni Muneer Basha, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that there are no specific overt acts attributable to the petitioner and that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offence and he has been falsely implicated by the police. It is further submitted that the petitioner is the sole earning member of his family, and, therefore, if he is incarcerated, it would cause undue hardship to his dependants. He is a law-abiding citizen. Hence, it is urged to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, Mr.A.Sai Rohit, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, vehemently opposed the grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner and submits that the investigation is not yet completed and that there are specific overt acts attributable on the part of the petitioner. If the petitioner is enlarged on pre-arrest bail, he may not cooperate with the Investigating

Officer and may evade the process of law. Therefore, he prays that the petition be dismissed.

4. Thoughtful consideration is bestowed upon the arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor. Perused the record.

5. *"Whether the petitioner/accused is entitled for pre-arrest bail?"*

6. As seen from the record, there are specific overt-acts attributed to the petitioner as it is alleged that he was indulged in dealing with 800 liters of FJ Wash and also 05 liters of I.D. Liquor and that there are five similar adverse antecedents. The petitioner has not mentioned all the details about his antecedents in the present Criminal Petition.

7. In view of the specific overt acts attributed against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner, as it would amount to giving a shield, or protection or license to the petitioner against whom specific allegations have been made, who has allegedly dealt with 600 liters of FJ Wash and 10 liters of I.D. Liquor, as per the judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab**[1]and **Sushila Aggarwal v. State of (NCT of Delhi)**[2].

[1]**(1980) 2 SCC 565**
(2020) 5 SCC 1

8. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant any relief to the petitioner herein as there are no merits.

9. In the result, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

As a sequel, Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall stand closed.

_____

DR. Y. LAKSHMANA RAO, J

Date: 15.10.2026

VMM

138

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION No.9010 of 2026

Date: 15.10.2026

VMM