



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

[3396]

**TUESDAY, THE TENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 711/2019

Between:

KARRI NAGAMANI, R/O D.NO. 5-4-310, BABJINAGAR, LAWSONSBAY
COLONY, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

- 1.STATE OF AP, REP.BY ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT
AT AMARAVATHI.
- 2.NALLAMILLI BRAHMANANDA REDDY, S/O RAMAKRISHNA REDDY,
AGE 49 YEARS, D.NO. 52-1-17, OLD RESAPUVANIPALEM,
VISAKHAPATNAM.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

- 1.PENUMAKA VENKATA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

- 1.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR (AP)

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The instant Criminal Revision Case under Sections 397 & 401 of Code of Criminal Procedure (for short 'Cr.P.C') has been filed by the Petitioner / Accused against the judgment dated 22.04.2019 passed by the learned II Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge, Visakhapatnam in CrI.A.No.115 of 2014 confirming the judgment dated 12.06.2014 passed in C.C.No.122 of 2014 by the learned Special Magistrate-IV, Visakhapatnam for the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (for short 'N.I.Act').

2. Heard Sri Penumaka Venkata Rao, learned counsel for the Petitioner and Ms.K.Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor. None appeared for Respondent No.2.

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner would submit that Respondent No.2 / Complainant had no financial capacity to lend such amount to the Petitioner. Learned counsel would further submit that, there was no proper service of notice under Ex.P.4. Learned counsel would submit that, both the trial Court as well as the Appellate Court failed to appreciate the evidence in a proper perspective.

4. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor would submit that the concurrent findings of the learned Appellate Judge as well as the learned trial Judge are well reasoned and no interference of this Court is warranted.

5. On perusal of the record, it is found that the Trial Court has elaborately considered the oral and documentary evidence placed on record. The Appellate Court, on independent re-assessment, has concurred with the findings of the Trial Court and assigned cogent reasons for affirming the conviction. The contention regarding the financial capacity of the Complainant has been duly addressed by the Courts below. Similarly, the issue relating to service of notice under Ex.P.4 has also been considered and answered against the Petitioner on the basis of evidence available on record.

6. This Court does not find any perversity, illegality, or material irregularity in the appreciation of evidence by the Courts below. The concurrent findings

are based on proper evaluation of facts and law and do not warrant interference in revisional jurisdiction.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case is dismissed.

Pending applications, if any, shall stand closed.

Date:10.02.2026
Dinesh

Dr.JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Crl.R.C.No.711 of 2019

Dt.10.02.2026

Dinesh