

APHC010070092026



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

[3396]

THURSDAY, THE TWELFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 148/2026

Between:

1. YANAMADALA VENKATA KRISHNA KUMARI, W/O VENUGOPALA RAO, AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS. HOUSEWIFE, R/O. PENUGANCHIPROLU VILLAGE AND MANDAL, NTR DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, , REP. BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATHI.

2. YANAMADALA VENUGOPALA RAO, S/O. LATE NAGESWARA RAO, AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS. EMPLOYEE, R/O. PENUGANCHIPROLU VILLAGE AND MANDAL, NTR DISTRICT.

3. YANAMANDALA NAGESWARA RAO, (DIED).

4. YANAMADALA KASTURI, W/O. NAGESWARA RAO, AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS, R/O. PENUGANCHIPROLU VILLAGE AND MANDAL, NTR DISTRICT.

5. SAKAMURI LAKSHMI KUMARI, W/O. VENKATESWARA RAO, AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS, HOUSEWIFE, R/O. PENUGANCHIPROLU VILLAGE AND MANDAL, NTR DISTRICT.

6. SAKAMURI VENKATESWARA RAO, S/O. VESAVA RAO, AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS, R/O. PENUGANCHIPROLU VILLAGE AND MANDAL, NTR DISTRICT.

7. BOOMI SRINIVASA RAO, S/O. SEETHARAMAIAH, AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS. CULTIVATION, R/O. PENUGANCHIPROLU VILLAGE AND MANDAL, NTR DISTRICT.

8. BOOMI RATNAMALA, W/O. SRINIVASA RAO, AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS. HOUSEWIFE, R/O. PENUGANCHIPROLU VILLAGE AND MANDAL, NTR DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Revision filed under Section 397/401 of CrPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the Criminal Revision Case, the High Court may be pleased to allow the Criminal Revision Case by setting aside the Order passed under Section 19 and 20 of Domestic Violence Act, vide Judgment dated 22.09.2025 passed in CRL.A.No. 89/2020 on the file of the Court of the Hon'ble XVI Additional District And Sessions Judge, Nandigama, partly allowing the order passed in D.V.C.No.11/2020 on the file of the court of the Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Jaggaiahpet;

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to dispense with the filing of the certified copy of the order in DVC.No. 11 of 2016 on the file of the court of the Additional Judicial Magistrate of First class cum Additional Junior Civil Judge, Jaggayyapeta 11 Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada dated 25.02.2020 in the interest of justice.

IA NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to directing the 2nd respondent to pay Rs.5,000/- per month to the petitioner towards interim maintenance till the disposal of the Criminal Revision Petition and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. NIRMALBABU A

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA**CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 148/2026****ORDER:**

This Criminal Revision Case is filed seeking to set aside the judgment dated 22.09.2025 passed in CrI.A. No. 89/2020 on the file of the learned XVI Additional District and Sessions Judge, Nandigama, whereby the appellate Court partly allowed the appeal arising out of D.V.C. No. 11/2016 on the file of the Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Jaggaiahpet.

2. The case of the petitioner, in brief, is that she is the legally wedded wife of the 1st respondent, and their marriage was solemnized on 01.07.1997 as per Hindu rites and customs. At the time of marriage, her parents allegedly gave cash, gold, silver ornaments, and other articles. After the marriage, they lived together happily for some time and were blessed with children.

(b) Subsequently, the 1st respondent allegedly developed bad habits and, along with respondents 2 to 7, subjected the petitioner to physical and mental harassment, demanding additional dowry. It is alleged that she was driven out of the matrimonial home and has been living separately along with her children. The petitioner further contends that the respondents attempted to dispossess her from the shared household and failed to provide maintenance despite having sufficient means. Hence, she filed D.V.C. No. 11 of 2016 seeking protection order, residence order, monetary relief, and other reliefs.

(c) The respondents resisted the petition contending that no dowry was given as alleged, and the petitioner voluntarily deserted the 1st respondent without any valid reason. It is further contended that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief, as she is living separately on her own accord and has sufficient means to maintain herself. The learned trial Court, after full-fledged enquiry, dismissed the petition holding that the petitioner failed to establish that she was subjected to domestic violence and that she had voluntarily deserted the 1st respondent. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner preferred an appeal.

(d) The learned appellate Court, upon reappreciation of the material on record, partly allowed the appeal and granted protection order under Section 18 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, residence order under Section 19 directing payment of Rs.3,000/- per month towards rent in lieu of alternate accommodation, and monetary relief of Rs.2,000/- per month under Section 20, while rejecting the other claims.

3. Heard Sri Nirmal Babu.A, learned counsel for the petitioner and MRs.K.Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor for the State.

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the appellate Court failed to properly appreciate that the petitioner is residing in a shared household and is entitled to reside therein, and that the monetary relief granted is inadequate considering the income of

the 1st respondent. It is also contended that compensation under Section 22 ought to have been granted.

5. Per contra, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor submits that the orders passed by the Courts below are well-reasoned and do not warrant interference in revision.

6. Considering the rival submissions and on perusal of the material available on record. The scope of interference in a revision is limited. This Court can interfere only when there is illegality, perversity, or material irregularity in the impugned order. Re-appreciation of evidence as an appellate Court is not permissible. In the present case, both the trial Court and the appellate Court have considered the oral evidence on record and recorded findings. The appellate Court, in fact, granted partial relief to the petitioner by way of protection order, residence order, and monetary relief.

7. On careful examination of the impugned judgment, this Court does not find any illegality, perversity, or material irregularity warranting interference. The findings are supported by reasons and do not suffer from any jurisdictional error. Hence, this Court finds no merit in the Criminal Revision Case.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case is dismissed, confirming the judgment dated 22.09.2025 passed in CrI.A. No. 89/2020 by the learned XVI Additional District and Sessions Judge, Nandigama. However, the petitioner is

at liberty to raise all her contentions and work out her remedies before the competent Court in accordance with law. Any such proceedings shall be decided on their own merits, without being influenced by any observations made in this order.

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

Dr. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Date: 12.02.2026
KKV

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

261

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 148 of 2026

Date 12.02.2026

KKV

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH:: AMARAVATI**MAIN CASE NO.: CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 148 OF 2026****PROCEEDING SHEET**

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
01	12.02.2026	<u>Dr.VJP,J</u> The Criminal Revision Case is dismissed. (Vide separate Order) <u>Dr.VJP, J</u> KKV	

