



**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 REVISION CASE NO: 454/2026

Between:

1. DOMADA DORASWARACHARI, S/O. LATE APPA RAO, AGED 42 YEARS, JUNIOR PLANT ATTENDANT, A.P GENCO, OFFICE OF D.E. BOILER MAINTENANCE DIVISION, I STAGE, V.T.P.S. IBRAHIMPATNAM VILLAGE, KRISHNA DIST-521456.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. SMT DOMADA URMI PANNAGA, W/O. DORASWARACHARI, D/O. RYALI SRINIVASA RAO, AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS. HOUSE WIFE. THANELANKA VILLAGE, MUMMADIVARAM MANDAL

2. DOMADA GOOGLE, S/O. DORASWARACHARI, 15 YEARS, STUDENT.

3. DOMADA VENKATA NAGALAKSHMI GAYATRI, D/O. DORASWARACHARI, AGE 13 YEARS, STUDENT.

4. THE STATE OF AP, REP ITS PP HIGH COURT OF AP AMARAVATHI

...RESPONDENT(S):

Revision filed under Section 397/401 of CrPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the Criminal Revision Case, the High Court may be pleased to call for the records relating to the order dated 16-12-2025 passed in CrI.M.P. No. 3208 of 2024 in M.C. No. 18 of 2024, on the file of the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Mummadvaram, insofar as it directs

attachment of the salary of the petitioner, and set aside the said order, and consequently allow the present Criminal Revision Case, and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to condone the delay of 36 days in filing the Criminal Revision Case, in the interest of justice, and pass

IA NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay the operation of the order dated 16-12-2025 passed in CrI.M.P. No. 3208 of 2024 in M.C. No. 18 of 2024, on the file of the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Mummadvaram, insofar as it relates to attachment of the salary of the petitioner for three months pending disposal of the above Criminal Revision Case, and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. J SIVA SANKARA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

2.

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA**CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 454/2026****ORDER:**

The present Criminal Revision Case has been filed under Section 438 and 442 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, challenging the Order dated 16.12.2025 in CrI.M.P.No.3208/2024 in M.C.No.18/2024 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate of First Class-cum-Civil Judge (Junior Division), Mummidivaram.

2. Heard Sri J. Siva Sankara Rao, learned counsel for the revision petitioner and Mrs.K.Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor takes notice on behalf of the State.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has been paying partial maintenance of Rs.10,000/- per month to respondent Nos.1 to 3. It is further submitted that the petitioner is employed as a Junior Plant Attendant at Vijayawada Thermal Power Station, Ibrahimpatnam, Krishna District, and that without properly determining the actual arrears and without affording adequate opportunity to the petitioner, the learned Magistrate directed attachment of the petitioner's salary. Therefore, he prays to set aside the impugned order.

4. A perusal of the material on record and the impugned order would show that the petitioner has not been paying maintenance regularly to respondent Nos.1 to 3 as directed by the Court. It is also noted that respondent Nos.2 and 3 are pursuing their studies and respondent No.1 is unable to meet their

educational and day-to-day expenses. In such circumstances, the learned Magistrate ordered attachment of the salary of the petitioner. This Court finds no illegality or irregularity in the said order.

4. It is well settled that unless the order under challenge suffers from jurisdictional error, manifest illegality, or perversity, this Court, in exercise of revisional jurisdiction, would not interfere. The revisional powers are limited and cannot be exercised as if it were an appellate jurisdiction. Upon careful perusal of the impugned order, this Court finds no material irregularity, perversity, or miscarriage of justice.

5. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court finds no grounds to entertain the present Criminal Revision Case.

6. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case is dismissed.

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

DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Date: 24.04.2026.

ARB

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 454/2026

Dt.24.04.2026

ARB