



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF APRIL,

TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B V L N CHAKRAVARTHI

IA No. 1 OF 2026

IN

CRLA NO: 190 OF 2026

Between:

Vari Narasingarao, S/o Pydayya, Aged about 45 years, K. Velama,
Hanuman temple, near Kothaveedhi, Narsipatnam, Visakhapatnam
District-531116.

...Appellant/Accused No.1

(Petitioner in CRLA 190 OF 2026

on the file of High Court)

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of
Andhra Pradesh, Amaravati, Guntur District, Through Station House
Officer, Kothakota Police Station, Visakhapatnam District.

...Respondent

(Respondents in-do-)

Counsel for the Petitioner : SRI SRAVAN KUMAR NAIDANA

Counsel for the Respondent : PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

Petition under Section 389(1) of Cr.P.C is filed praying that in the
circumstances stated in the memorandum of grounds of criminal appeal,
the High Court may be pleased to enlarge the appellant on bail by
suspending the judgment dt.05-03-2026, N.S.C.No.405/2017 on the file of
the Calender Case Tried By The Court of IX Addl. District & Sessions

Judge's Court at Chodavaram, including fine amount, pending disposal of CRLA No.190 of 2026, on the file of the High Court.

The court while directing issue of notice to the Respondents herein to show cause as to why this application should not be complied with, made the following order.(The receipt of this order will be deemed to be the receipt of notice in the case).

ORDER:

Heard Sri N. Sravan Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner/appellant appearing virtually, and Sri A. Sai Rohit, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State.

2. The petitioner/appellant is Accused No. 1 in N.S.C. No. 405 of 2017 on the file of the learned IX Additional District and Sessions Judge, Chodavaram.

3. The petitioner/appellant was found guilty of the offence punishable under Section 20(b)(ii)(c) read with Section 8(c) of the NDPS Act, 1985. Accordingly, he was convicted under Section 235(2) Cr.P.C. and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of ten (10) years and to pay a fine of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only), and in default of payment of fine, to suffer simple imprisonment for a period of two (2) years.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner/ appellant submitted that the learned trial Court erroneously convicted the petitioner/ appellant without properly appreciating the facts and evidence on record. Hence, the petitioner/appellant has preferred the present appeal challenging the judgment of the learned trial Court on various grounds.

5. Learned counsel further submitted that four accused were prosecuted in the case and that the learned trial Court found Accused Nos. 2 to 4 not guilty of the aforementioned offence, but convicted

Accused No. 1 solely on the basis of the alleged confession of Accused Nos. 2 to 4, while acquitting them.

6. He further submitted that there is no material on record to show that, while the petitioner/appellant was on bail during trial, he was involved in any similar offence or any other offence under the NDPS Act, and hence Section 37 of the NDPS Act has no application to the facts of the present case. There are no allegations of breach of bail conditions during the trial. Learned counsel also submitted that the petitioner/appellant is presently lodged in Central Prison, Visakhapatnam. He fairly submitted that the fine amount has not yet been paid by the petitioner/appellant.

7. Learned counsel further submitted that the sentence imposed by the learned trial Court is a fixed sentence of ten (10) years; that there are fair chances of success in the appeal; and that there is no likelihood of the appeal being taken up for hearing in the near future.

8. He also submitted that the appeal may take considerable time for hearing and, considering the circumstances of the case, the petitioner/appellant may be released on bail by suspending the sentence of imprisonment imposed by the learned trial Court.

9. The learned Assistant Public Prosecutor opposed the application; however, no written objections were filed. As per instructions, he submitted that the petitioner/appellant was on bail during the trial and prior thereto, and that he did not commit any similar offence or any other offence while on bail, nor was he involved in any such offence earlier.

10. Heard the submissions made by the learned counsel on both sides.

11. In light of the above submissions, the specific circumstance that arises is that, admittedly, no material is available before this Court to conclude that the petitioner/appellant is likely to commit any similar offence or any other offence if released on bail, as contemplated under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

12. Considering the above facts and circumstances, particularly the fact that the sentence imposed is a fixed sentence of ten (10) years and that there is no likelihood of the appeal being taken up for hearing in the near future, this Court is of the considered opinion that "the sentence of imprisonment alone imposed by the learned IX Additional District and Sessions Judge, Chodavaram, vide judgment dated 05.03.2026 in N.S.C. No. 405 of 2017 against the petitioner/appellant/Accused No. 1, shall be suspended during the pendency of the appeal, subject to the following conditions":

i) The petitioner/appellant shall be enlarged on bail upon executing a personal bond for Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-Five Thousand only), with two (02) sureties each for a like sum, to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

ii) Upon such release, the petitioner/appellant shall appear before the learned trial Court on every fourth Saturday of the month until disposal of the appeal.

iii) The petitioner/appellant shall pay 25% of the fine amount before the learned trial Court within four (4) weeks from the date of this order and file proof of such payment before this Court.

iv) The petitioner/appellant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

v) The petitioner/appellant shall not involve in any similar offence or any other offence under the NDPS Act in future.

vi) In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, the prosecution is at liberty to file an application seeking cancellation of bail.

13. Accordingly, the application is allowed.

//TRUE COPY//

SD/- G.HELANAIDU
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The IX Additional District & Sessions Judge, Chodavaram.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Visakhapatnam.
3. The Station House Officer, Kothakota Police Station, Visakhapatnam District.
4. One CC to Sri. Sravan Kumar Naidana, Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CCs to Public Prosecutor, High Court of AP [OUT]
6. The Section Officer, Criminal Section, High Court of AP
7. One spare copy

HIGH COURT

BVLNC,J

DATED:23/04/2026

LIST THE MATTER IN THE MONTH OF AUGUST, 2026 IN THE USUAL
COURSE

ORDER

IA.No.1 OF 2026

IN

CRLA.No.190 of 2026

ALLOWED

