

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI
THURSDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF MAY,
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX



:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA
CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 3127, 3275 & 3383 OF 2026

CRLP.No.3127 of 2026:

Between:

1. Velagala Chandra Shekhar Reddy, S/o Venkat Reddy, Age 56 years, R/o D.No.8-265, Canal road, Ravulapalem Mandal, Konaseema District-533238.

...Petitioner/Accused No.2

2. G N V. Chandra Shekhar Reddy, S/o Satyannarayana Reddy Age 49 years, R/o Flat no.402, SVS Shriyans apartments, Chhikoti gardens, Begumpet, Hyderabad-500016.

...Petitioner/Accused No.3

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Through Station House Officer,
Visakhapatnam III Town Police Station Rep. by its Public Prosecutor
High Court of Andhra Pradesh At Amaravathi

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the memorandum of grounds of criminal petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner/Accused in connection with Cr.No.40 of 2026 of III Town Police Station Visakhapatnam, directing the respondent police to enlarge the petitioner/Accused No.2 & 3 on bail in the event of his arrest in connection with the said case

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and memorandum of grounds and upon hearing the arguments of M/s Karlapudi Akhila, Advocate for the Petitioners and Public Prosecutor for the Respondent;

CRLP NO: 3275 OF 2026:

Between:

Mekala Lakshmi Manga Tayaru, W/o.Nagabhushanam, Aged 52 years,R/o.2-99, Mekala Vari Street,Yenamadurru, Bhimavaram,West Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh.

...Petitioner/Accused No.5

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by the Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amaravathi.
2. Cherukuri Sireesha, W/o.Sandeep, Aged 39 years,R/o.Balaji 99 Uplands, 4th floor, Flat.No.401,Ram Nagar, Visakhapatnam District.

...Respondent/Defacto – Complainant

Petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the memorandum of grounds of criminal petition, the High Court may be pleased to enlarge the Petitioner/Accused No.5 on Anticipatory Bail in the event of her arrest in Crime No. 40 of 2026 on the file of III Town Police Station, Visakhapatnam Commissionerate, Visakhapatnam District;

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and memorandum of grounds and upon hearing the arguments of Sri P.L.Narasimha Rao, Advocate for the Petitioner and Public Prosecutor for Respondent No.1;

CRLP NO: 3383 OF 2026:

Between:

1. Velagala Mani Hamsa, W/o Teja Reddy R/o D. No. 8-2-31/C/2B Banjara hills, Road No.10,14 road, Ibrahim Nagar, IAS Officers Quarters, Nandi Nagar, Hyderabad, Telangana-500034.

...Petitioner/Accused 1

2. Chinnam Teja Reddy, S/o Venu Reddy, R/o D. No. 8-2-31/C/2B Banjara hills. Road No.10,14 road, Ibrahim Nagar, IAS Officers Quarters, Nandi Nagar, Hyderabad, Telangana-500034.

...Petitioner/Accused 4

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep by Station House Officer,
Visakhapatnam III Town Police Station, Rep. by its Public
Prosecutor High Court of Andhra Pradesh At Amaravathi

...Respondent/Complainant

Petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the memorandum of grounds of criminal petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner/ Accused in connection with Cr.No.40 of 2026 of III Town Police Station Visakhapatnam directing the respondent police to enlarge the petitioner/Accused No.1 AND 4 on bail in the event of his arrest in connection with the said case;

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and memorandum of grounds and upon hearing the arguments of M/s Karlapudi Akhila, Advocate for the Petitioners and Public Prosecutor for Respondent, the Court made the following;

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos. 3127, 3275 and 3383 of 2026

COMMON ORDER:

These Criminal Petitions have been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNSS') by the Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 5 for granting of pre-arrest bail in connection with in Cr.No.40 of 2026 of III Town Police Station Visakhapatnam, registered for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 329(4), 351(2), 108 r/w 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short "BNS").

2. Since the subject matter of these Criminal Petitions is one and the same, at the request of the learned counsel on both sides, these matters are heard together and the following common order has been passed.

3. Heard Ms. Karlapudi Akhila, learned counsel for the petitioners in CrI.P.Nos.3127 and 3383 of 2026/Accused Nos.1 to 4, Sri P.L. Narasimha Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner in CrI.P.No.3275 of 2026/Accused No.5, Sri Shaik Meeravali, learned counsel for the respondent No.2 in CrI.P.Nos.3127 and 3383 of 2026, Ms. Sodum Anvesha, learned counsel for the respondent No.2 in CrI.P.No.3275 of 2026 and Ms. K. Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor representing on behalf of the State.

4. The case of the prosecution, as per the complaint lodged by the 2nd respondent herein, is that her mother, Smt. Alluri Manikumari, committed suicide on 04.04.2026 due to alleged harassment and humiliation meted out by a "syndicate" of six individuals, including the petitioners. The genesis of the

dispute is stated to be certain financial transactions between the father of the de-facto complainant, Sri Alluri Padmanabha Prasada Rao, and some of the accused persons.

Arguments advanced by the learned counsel appearing for the Accused

Nos.1 and 4:

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 4 would submit that initially the case was registered for the offence punishable under Section 194 of the BNSS, and later it was altered to Sections 329(4), 351(2), and 108 read with 3(5) of the BNS. Learned counsel would further submit that the complaint itself would reveal that the accused had disputes with the complainant and her father regarding financial transactions. The accused had no intention to instigate or provoke the deceased to commit suicide, and their efforts were only towards recovery of a lawful debt borrowed by the father of the de-facto complainant through bank transactions. It is purely a commercial debt owed by the Management of Kakatiya Finance to the petitioners.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 4 would further submit that the dispute is purely civil in nature and has been given a criminal colour only to avoid financial liability. Learned counsel for the petitioners would further submit that there is no proximity between the alleged harassment and the death. The alleged incident occurred on 23.02.2026, whereas the deceased committed suicide on 04.04.2026.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 4 would further submit that Accused No.1 has two children aged about one year and five years respectively. Learned counsel would submit that there was no direct or indirect contact between the petitioners and the deceased. They never communicated with the deceased, and therefore, the question of abetment to commit suicide does not arise in this matter. No specific overt acts are attributed against the petitioners.

8. Learned counsel for Accused Nos.1 and 4 would further submit that the father of the de-facto complainant borrowed an amount of Rs.7 crores and 10 lakhs from Accused Nos.1 and 4 through RTGS. The father of the de-facto complainant suddenly vacated the house, and his whereabouts are not known. While searching for him, they contacted the de-facto complainant, and Accused Nos.1 and 4 visited their house; however, they did not even enter the house on 23.02.2026, as the police were called. The police have bound them over.

9. Learned counsel would further submit that no offence is made out against Accused Nos.1 and 4, and that merely asking the borrower to repay the amount would not constitute an intention to instigate the deceased to commit suicide. The deceased had nothing to do with the petitioners. The petitioners are willing to cooperate with the investigation and are ready to furnish sureties to the satisfaction of the Court. Learned counsel finally prayed to allow the petition.

Arguments advanced by the learned counsel appearing for the Accused Nos.2 and 3:

10. Learned counsel for Accused Nos.2 and 3 would submit that they have never visited the house of the de-facto complainant at any point of time. A cheque was issued towards payment of the due amount, which was dishonoured. They have not even filed a private complaint for the offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act against the de-facto complainant or her family members.

Arguments advanced by the learned counsel appearing for the Accused No.5:

11. Learned counsel for the petitioner/Accused No.5 would submit that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. No specific overt acts are attributed against the petitioner/Accused No.5. Learned counsel would further submit that the petitioner/Accused No.5 was never in contact with the deceased at any point of time, either directly or indirectly, and that the allegation of abetment of suicide has been falsely made.

12. Learned counsel would further submit that the dispute pertains to financial transactions that took place during the years 2017 and 2018 between Accused Nos.1 and 4 and the father of the de-facto complainant, who is the husband of the deceased. The petitioner/Accused No.5 was not present at the house of the de-facto complainant during the alleged incident on 23.02.2026, nor at the wedding on 05.03.2026, or at the meeting on 25.03.2026. She has

nothing to do with the said transactions and is neither a beneficiary nor a party to the transactions between the accused and the father of the de-facto complainant.

13. Learned counsel would further submit that the petitioner is not residing within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court and has directly approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail since the case is registered at Visakhapatnam. The present petitioner/Accused No.5 is residing in West Godavari District. She is a woman aged about 51 years and has a reasonable apprehension of arrest in the present case. There are no criminal antecedents against the petitioner. Learned counsel would further submit that she is ready to furnish sureties to the satisfaction of the Court and prayed to allow the petition.

Arguments advanced by the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor representing the State:

14. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor would submit that there is a suicide note referring to the names of the petitioners, and CCTV footage is also available in respect of the alleged incident that occurred on 23.02.2026. On 23.02.2026, a complaint was given by the de-facto complainant to the police, and the same was considered by the police. The investigation is at a nascent stage.

Arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the respondent No.2 in CrI.P.No.3275 of 2026:

15. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 would submit that the petitioners directly approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

Arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the respondent No.2 in Crl.P.Nos.3127 and 3383 of 2026:

16. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 in the petition filed by the A1 and A4 would submit that the presence of Accused Nos.1 and 4 is established in the incident dated 23.02.2026. They threatened the deceased with dire consequences and continued their threats and coercion for one month. Even during the wedding function, they created galata. They are influential persons. The pressure exerted by the petitioners/Accused Nos.1 and 4 compelled the deceased to commit suicide. Learned counsel vehemently opposed the petition and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

17. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel on both sides and upon perusal of the material placed on record before this Court, this Court finds that Accused No.5 has no *prima facie* role in the alleged offence. She is not shown to be present at any of the alleged incidents and is an outsider having no connection with the financial transactions in question. On the other hand, Accused Nos.1 and 4 are stated to have been involved in the alleged incidents, and Accused Nos.2 and 3 are the beneficiaries of the said financial transactions. It is also noted that the investigation is at a nascent

stage. In that view of the matter, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the Accused No.5.

18. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition Nos. 3127 and 3383 of 2026 are dismissed. The Criminal Petition No.3275 of 2026 is allowed and the Accused No.5 is hereby granted anticipatory bail subject to following conditions:

i) The petitioner/Accused No.5 shall appear before the concerned Jurisdictional Court, within one (1) week from today and shall furnish a personal bond for Rs.20,000/- (Rupees twenty thousand only), with two sureties for the like sum each, to the satisfaction of the concerned Jurisdictional Court;

ii) The petitioner/Accused No.5 shall be available for investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer;

iii) The petitioner/Accused No.5 shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Investigating or Police Officer.

iv) The petitioner/Accused No.5 shall surrender her passport, if any, to the concerned Court. If she claims that she does not have a passport, she shall submit an affidavit to that effect to the concerned Court.

v) The petitioner/Accused No.5 shall not leave the country without obtaining prior permission from the concerned Court.

vi) The petitioner/Accused No.5 shall appear before the concerned Station House Officer, once in a week, i.e., on every Sunday, between 10.00 am and 05.00 pm, till filing of charge sheet.

19. In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

20. It is also made clear that the observations made in this order are only for the purpose of deciding the bail application and they shall not be construed as opinion on the merits of the Crime.

SD/- U.SRIDEVI
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
SECTION OFFICER

//TRUE COPY

F

To,


1. The Station House Officer, Visakhapatnam III Town Police Station, Visakhapatnam Commissionerate, Visakhapatnam District.
2. Cherukuri Sireesha, W/o.Sandeep, R/o.Balaji 99 Uplands, 4th floor, Flat.No.401,Ram Nagar, Visakhapatnam District. (by RPAD)
3. One CC to Sri P.L.Narasimha Rao, Advocate [OPUC]
4. One CC to M/s Karlapudi Akhila, Advocate [OPUC]
5. One CC to M/s Sodum Anvesha, Advocate [OPUC]
6. Two CCs to Public Prosecutor, High Court of AP [OUT]
7. One spare copy

HIGH COURT

Dr.VJP,J

DATED:07/05/2026

ORDER



CRLP.No.3127, 3275 & 3383 of 2026

**CRLP.NOS.3127 AND 3383 OF 2026 ARE DISMISSED
CRLP.NO.3275 OF 2026 ALLOWED**