



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

[3396]

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 3019/2026

Between:

1. SURISETTY RAGHAVENDRA RAO, S/O JANKI RAM, AGED ABOUT
32 YEARS. PRIVATE EMPLOYEE, R/O. 61-9-9/3-3, 2ND LINE,
PURNACHANDRA NAGAR, RAMALINGESWARANAGAR,
VIJAYAWADA. NTR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, Represented by S.H.O,
Patamata PS, NTR Commissionerate, Rep. Through the Public
Prosecutor, High Court of A.P., State of Andhra Pradesh.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused:

1. NAGI REDDY GUJJULA

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant:

1. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA**CRIMINAL PETITION No: 3019 of 2026****Order:**

The Criminal Petition has been filed under Sections 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNSS') for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner/Accused, in connection with Crime No.405 of 2025 of Patama Police Station, NTR Commissionerate, registered for the offences under Sections 318(4) and 316(5) of BNS.

2. Heard Sri Nagi Reddy Gujjula, learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms. K. Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor.

3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that, the petitioner/accused is working in Apollo Pharmacy, Gurunanak Colony Branch, Vijayawada as in-charge of the Pharmacy since 9 years. The de facto complainant Phanindrapu Ram Babu is working as Senior Executive in the Apollo Pharmacy for the last 8 years. On complaint that cash was not credited to the company account from the Gurunanak Colony Branch, on 12.07.2025 he went to the said branch and on verification found Rs.4,03,077-43 paise difference. On 14.07.2025 they verified the stock it is found difference of stock worth of Rs.6,86,494-09 paise upto 06.07.2025. On enquiry it is revealed that the accused with an dishonest intention, kept the QR code linked to his Bank account for medicines sold, instead of company account.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that petitioner is innocent and he is falsely implicated in the present crime. The present case

has been registered against the petitioner without conducting any preliminary enquiry. The petitioner is having old aged parents and he is the sole bread winner of his family. Hence, prays to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

5. Ms. K. Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, would submit that the petitioner intentionally changed QR code of the company and placed QR code of his account and got deposited the amounts into his account to an extent of Rs.6,86,494-09 paise. The bank statement of petitioner received from HDFC Bank proves that he transferred and took the cash of the company through scan of his account. It is further submitted that investigation is in progress and prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. A perusal of material on record would show that there is prima facie material against the petitioner herein that he misused the company funds by diverting the deposited amounts to his account. It is submitted by the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor that investigation is in progress.

7. In **Sushila Aggarwal and others Vs. State (NCT of Delhi) and another¹**, it was observed that:

“When a person complains of apprehension of arrest and approaches for order, the application should be based on concrete facts (and not vague or general allegations) relatable to one or other specific offence. The application seeking anticipatory bail should contain bare essential facts relating to the offence, and why the applicant reasonably apprehends arrest, as well as his side of the story. These are essential for the court which

should consider his application, to evaluate the threat or apprehension, its gravity or seriousness and the appropriateness of any condition that may have to be imposed. It is not essential that an application should be moved only after an FIR is filed; it can be moved earlier, so long as the facts are clear and there is reasonable basis for apprehending arrest.”

8. In the facts and circumstances of the case and in the light of the observations made in the aforesaid decision and considering the stage of investigation, at this juncture, this Court is not inclined to consider request of petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail at this stage.

9. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

Dr. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Date: 24.04.2026
ARB

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL PETITION No: 3019 of 2026

Date: 24.04.2026

ARB