



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

[3396]

**TUESDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX
PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA
CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 2460/2026**

Between:

- 1.KILLI DALI NAIDU, S/O.MUTYALA NAIDU,AGED ABOUT 69 YEARS,OCCULTIVATION, R/O.H.NO.6-32,RAMAJOGIPALEM, CHODAVARAM MANDAL,ANAKAPALLIAISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
- 2.KILLI CHINDRAMMA, W/O.DALI NAIDU,AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,OCCULTIVATION, R/O.H.NO.6-32,RAMAJOGIPALEM, CHODAVARAM MANDAL,ANAKAPALLI/VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
- 3.KILLI CHINDRAMMA,, W/O.DALI NAIDU, AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS, OCC CULTIVATION, R/O.H.NO.6-32, RAMAJOGIPALEM, CHODAVARAM MANDAL, ANAKAPALLI/VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)

AND

- 1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, Through Station House Officer,Chodavaram P.S, Rep.by itsPublic Prosecutor, High Court BuildingsAt Amaravati, Guntur District, A.P.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

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 may be pleased to direct the Respondent Police to enlarge the Petitioners/Accused (1 and 3) on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.363 of 2024, of Chodavaram Police station, Anakapalli/ Visakhapatnam District, A.P, and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused(S):

- 1.G..SRINIVASU
- 2.G SRINIVASU

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant:

- 1.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following:**ORDER:**

This Criminal Petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 by the Petitioners/A.1 and A.3 seeking to enlarge them on bail in the event of their arrest in connection with Crime No.363 of 2024 of Chodavaram Police Station, Anakapalli, Visakhapatnam District, which is registered for the offences punishable under Sections 109(1), 118(1), 351(2), 49 read with 3(5) of BNS, 2023.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the *de facto* Complainant namely, Ms.Killi Lakshmi, who is the resident of Ramajogipalem, gave a complaint against A.1 to A.3 alleging that on 16.12.2024, A.1 and his son A.2 dashed her father on a bike for which he fell on road and all A.1 to A.3 allegedly beat her father with a view to kill him. At the relevant point of time, witnessed the incident and tried to warn the Accused. Then A.2 beat the complainant on her head with an iron rod and caused bleeding injury. A.1 and his wife (A.3) hacked her with a knife on the face of the cousin(Demudu Naidu) of the complainant. Basing on the complaint of the *de facto* complainant, a case in Crime No.363 of 2024 of Chodavaram Police Station, Anakapalli District was registered against A.1 to A.3 for the offences stated *supra*.

3. Heard Sri G.Srinivasu, learned counsel for the Petitioners and Ms.K.Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor for respondent/State. Perused the material on record.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioners would submit that the Petitioner No.1/A.1 got an ancestral property to an extent of Ac.3.50 cents situated at Chakipalli Revenue and according to the revenue records, the subject land stood in the name of Petitioner /No.1. Further, the present crime is registered against the Petitioners as a counter blast to the case in Crime No.362 of 2024. The said Crime is registered based on the complaint given by A.1 herein against A.1 to A.6 therein, wherein, the *de facto* Complainant in Crime No.363 of 2024 is arrayed as A.4. Learned counsel would submit that material part of the investigation in the present crime is completed and A.2 has already been released on bail as per the orders dated 18.02.2025 in CrI.M.P.No.208 of 2025 on the file of the Court of IX Additional District and Sessions Judge, Chodavaram. Learned counsel would further submit that the petitioners herein are suffering with old age ailments and requested to enlarge them on bail in event of their arrest.

5. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor on instructions would submit that it is not a fit case for grant of bail since there are specific allegations made against the Petitioner to attract the alleged offences. Further, the earlier petitions *vide* CrI.P.Nos.7890 of 2025 and 10433 of 2025 were dismissed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court on 22.08.2025 and 16.10.2025 and there are no changed circumstances in the present criminal petition which is filed for grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the submissions made and a fair look at the material on record would show that undisputedly, the application seeking anticipatory bail

filed by the Petitioners before this Court were dismissed. The present petition is filed without there being any substantial change in circumstances. It is well settled that successive bail applications are maintainable only when there is a material change in circumstances. In the absence of any such change, this Court is not inclined to consider the case of the Petitioners for grant of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is dismissed.

Pending applications, if any, shall stand closed.

DR.JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

*Mjl/**
07.04.2026

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Criminal Petition No.2460 of 2026

07.04.2026

*Mjl /**