



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

**[3396]**

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

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA**

**CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 2556/2026**

**Between:**

1.ARAJALLA HARI, S/O. BOSAYYA, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, R/O.  
DOOR NO.22-16- 13, BUKKA VEEDHI, I TOWN, VISAKHAPATNAM  
CITY, N/O. CHEPALAKANCHERU VILLAGE,VIZIANAGARAM  
DISTRICT

**...PETITIONER/ACCUSED**

**AND**

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

2.VICTIM WOMEN, /GIRL

**...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT(S):**

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 release of the  
petitioner/Accused on bail in connection with Crime (FIR) No. 18 of 2026 of I  
Town Police Station, Visakhapatnam, Under Section 69 BNS, Pending  
enquiry and trial,

**Counsel for the Petitioner/accused:**

1.KAKUMANU JOJI AMRUTHA RAJU

**Counsel for the Respondent/complainant(S):**

1.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

**THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA****CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 2556/2026****ORDER:-**

The Criminal Petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNSS') by the petitioner/Accused, seeking regular bail in Crime (FIR) No. 18 of 2026 of I Town Police Station, Visakhapatnam, registered for the offences punishable under Section 69 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short "BNS").

2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that, on 09.02.2026 at 1400 hours, the complainant came to PS and reported that from the age of 16 years, a person by name Hari had been stalking her and repeatedly proposing marriage, which she initially refused. Later, the accused disclosed the matter to the complainant's mother and gained her trust. Thereafter, the accused forced the complainant to have sexual relation, which she initially refused. Subsequently, believing the deceitful promises of marriage made by the accused, the complainant consented, and they had sexual intercourse twice in July 2025 at the accused Hari's house, and again on further occasion in August 2025. Thereafter, the complainant did not get her menstrual periods from July 2025 and, upon medical examination conducted after August 2025, she came to know that she was pregnant. Further, the complainant stated that she informed the said pregnancy to her family members and also to the accused.

However, the accused prolonged the matter without marrying her and ultimately refused to marry her.

3. Heard Sri Kakumanu Joji Amrutha Raju, learned counsel for the petitioner/accused and Mrs.K.Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor on behalf of the State. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor would submit that notice was served on the defacto complainant through police and received instructions to submit arguments.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner herein is innocent and has nothing to do with the alleged offence. He was falsely implicated in the present case at the instance of the victim/complainant. He has been in judicial custody since 09.02.2026. There is no *prima facie* material against him. Learned counsel finally submits that the petitioner is ready to furnish sureties to the satisfaction of the Court and the request of the petitioner for bail may be considered.

5. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, appearing on behalf of the State, vehemently opposed the petition and submitted that it is a case of rape on the victim on the promise of love and marriage. The investigation is still pending and material witnesses are yet to be examined and no charge sheet is filed. She submitted that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is every likelihood of him tampering with evidence, influencing witnesses, and hampering the ongoing investigation. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, therefore, prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. Considering the submissions made and on perusal of the material on record, as rightly contended by the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, there is *prima facie* material against the petitioner. The contentions raised in the present petition are disputed questions of fact and requires detailed enquiry. In that view of the matter, having regard to the seriousness and gravity of the allegations and the stage of the investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner/Accused at this stage.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

Consequently, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

---

**DR.VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA, J**

Date: 15.04.2026

UPS

38

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

**CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 2556 OF 2026**

**Dt: 15.04.2026**

UPS