



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

[3396]

WEDNESDAY, THE ELEVENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 811/2026

Between:

SARE SATEESH KUMAR, S/O SATYANARAYANA, AGED ABOUT 22
YEARS, R/O. MOOLASAGARAM, NANDYAL TOWN DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PUBLIC
PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT
AMARAVATI.

2. PAGIDALA CHAKALI MALLESWARAYYA, S/O. CHAKALI
SRINIVASULU AGED ABOUT 23 YEARS, R/O. KRANTHI
NAGAR, NANDYAL TOWN AND DISTRICT

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused:

1. RAJA DAMOJI RAO

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant(S):

1. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The instant petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed seeking to grant anticipatory bail to the Petitioner / Accused No.2, in connection with Crime No.80 of 2025 on the file of Nandyal III Town Police Station, Nandyal, which is registered for the offences under Sections 118(1) and 351(3) read with 3(5) of BNS.

2. The case of the prosecution, in concise, is that on 28.05.2025 at 20.00 hours, beside Lucky Café, Bommalastram, Nandyal Town, Accused Nos.1

and 2 picked up quarrel with the *De facto* complainant and had thrown a cool drink bottle on him and the same hit to his nose and upper lip and caused bleeding injury. Accused No.2 had thrown another cool drink bottle towards the elder brother of the *De facto* complainant and the same hit to his right shoulder and on his head.

3. Heard Sri T.Raja Damoji Rao, learned counsel for the Petitioner and Sri K.Sandeep, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor for State/Respondent.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner would submit that the Petitioner is innocent of the offences alleged against him. Learned counsel would further submit that there are no independent witnesses, CCTV footage or any third party evidence to support the prosecution version. It is further submitted that material part of the investigation has been completed. The Petitioner is ready to furnish sureties to the satisfaction of the Court. Hence, prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the Petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor would submit that the investigation is still pending for examination of the material witnesses. It is further submitted that, there are criminal antecedents against the Petitioner and if the Petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, there is every possibility of hampering the investigation and tampering with the evidence. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. Considering the submissions made and a bare perusal of the material placed on record would go to show that there are specific overt acts attributed against the Petitioner and the investigation is at a crucial stage.

The examination of material witnesses is yet to be completed. The apprehension expressed by the prosecution regarding possible interference with the investigation cannot be brushed aside, especially in light of the criminal antecedents attributed to the Petitioner. Anticipatory bail is an extraordinary relief to be granted only in exceptional circumstances. At this stage, this Court does not find any such exceptional circumstances warranting the exercise of discretion in favour of the Petitioner.

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

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

Dr.JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Date:11.02.2026
Dinesh

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.811 of 2026

DATE:11.02.2026

Dinesh