



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

[3396]

WEDNESDAY, THE FIRST DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 2004/2026

Between:

1. CHIKKALA USHA SATYA BALA, D/O VARA PRASAD RAO, AGED ABOUT 24 YEARS, R/O D.NO. 3-55, NERELLAMA COLONY, KAKINADA.

...PETITIONER/COMPLAINANT

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY PP HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATHI. THROUGH STATION HOUSE OFFICER, INDRAPALEM POLICE STATION, ALLURI SITARAMARAJU DISTRICT.

2. KARRI ARAVIND, S/O APPA RAO, AGED ABOUT 23 YEARS, R/O D.NO.1-27, VIDYANAGAR, ALLURI SITARAMARAJU DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENTS:

Petition under Section 437/438/439/482 of Cr.P.C and 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court pleased to set aside the Order dated 10.12.2025 passed in CrI.M.P Bail No. 433 of 2025 on the file of the Hon'ble Court of the VI Addl. Sessions Judge, Kakinada and Consequently cancel the Bail granted to the Respondent no.2 /Accused in connection with Crime No. 244 of 2025 of Indrapalem Police Station, Kakinada district, and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. SHAIK ASIF

Counsel for the Respondents:

1.SASANKA BHUVANAGIRI

2.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA**CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 2004/2026****ORDER:**

This Criminal Petition has been filed by the Petitioner herein, seeking to set aside the Order dated 10.12.2025 passed in CrI.M.P Bail No. 433 of 2025 on the file of the learned VI Additional Sessions Judge, Kakinada and consequently, cancel the Bail granted to the Respondent no.2 /Accused in connection with Crime No. 244 of 2025 of Indrapalem Police Station, Kakinada district.

2. Heard Ms.Ayesha Azma.S., learned counsel representing Sri Shaik Asif, learned counsel for the petitioner/complainant, Sri Sasanka Bhuvanagiri, learned counsel for the respondent No.2/accused and Ms.K.Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present petition has been filed seeking cancellation of the bail granted to respondent No. 2/accused on the ground that no notice was issued to the victim in the bail application, and in her absence, bail was granted to respondent No. 2. She further submits that, after his release, respondent No. 2/accused threatened the victim and her parents. A complaint was submitted to the police; however, no action was taken. Subsequently, the petitioner approached the Superintendent of Police, Kakinada, by filing a complaint through the Public

Grievance Redressal System, which is currently pending consideration before the Superintendent of Police, Kakinada.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2/accused submits that the petitioner/victim was very much present before the District Court at the time when bail was granted to the accused. The victim had assisted the Public Prosecutor in the said bail application, and therefore, it cannot be contended that the accused was released on bail behind her back.

5. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor submits that the Station House Officer has not received any complaint, and that the complaint was submitted under the Public Grievance Redressal System to the Superintendent of Police, Kakinada, which is pending consideration before the Superintendent of Police, Kakinada. She further submits that the petitioner/victim attended the Court and assisted the Public Prosecutor before the District Court at the time when bail was granted to the respondent No.2/accused.

6. Considering the submissions made, it is needless to state that the considerations for grant of bail and for cancellation of bail are distinct. In the present case, the contention of the petitioner that the accused was released on bail behind her back appears to be incorrect, in the light of the submission made by the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, based on information obtained from the concerned Public Prosecutor who appeared before the District Court, pursuant to the direction issued by this Court vide order dated 31.03.2026 to enquire into such issue. In the light of the aforementioned

premises, the complaint which is presented by the complainant/victim is pending before the Superintendent of Police, Kakinada under PGRS. Therefore, it is apposite to dispose of the present petition, with a direction to the Superintendent of Police, Kakinada, to look into the PGRS complaint which was presented by the victim and take appropriate steps according to law. In case, if there is any truth in the contention that the accused threatened the complainant/victim, the prosecution is at liberty to file an application for cancellation of the bail.

7. With the above said observations, the Criminal Petition is disposed of.

As a sequel thereto, the miscellaneous applications, if any, pending in this Criminal Petition shall stand closed.

DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Date: 01.04.2026.

UPS

50

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 2004/2026

Dt.01.04.2026

UPS