

[ 3521 ]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

FRIDAY, THE NINETEENTH DAY OF JUNE

TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 4520 OF 2026



**Between:**

Kamireddy Satyanarayana Reddy, S/o. Sundara Ranpa Reddy, aged about 68 years, R/o Chillakuru Village, Pellakuru Mandal, Tirupati District.

**Petitioner/Accused No.1**

**AND**

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court Andhra Pradesh, Amaravati, Through Station House Officer, Pellakuru Police Station, Tirupati District.

**Respondent/Respondent**

Petition under Sections 480 & 483 of BNSS, praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to enlarge the Petitioner/Accused No.1 on bail in Crime No.51 of 2026, dated 09.04.2026 on the file of Pellakuru Police Station, Tirupati District.

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and the grounds filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Sudharsana Reddy J, Advocate for the Petitioner and of PUBLIC PROSECUTOR for the Respondent and the Court made the following;

**The Court made the following:**

**ORDER:**

The Criminal Petition has been filed under Sections 480 and 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNSS'), seeking to enlarge the Petitioner/Accused No.1 on bail in Crime No.51 of 2026 of Pellakur Police Station, Tirupati District, registered against the Petitioner/Accused No.1 herein for the offences punishable under Sections 364, 342, 384, 323, 506(2), 120B read with 120-A, 109, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for brevity 'the IPC').

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 16.12.2023 at about 3:20 p.m., while the de-facto complainant, Duvvuru Rakesh Reddy, was proceeding on his motorcycle near the old Electrical Sub-Station at Chillakur Village, Pellakur Mandal, Accused Nos.2 to 9, who are alleged associates of Accused No.1, acting in furtherance of their common intention and pursuant to a criminal conspiracy, abducted him with an intention to murder him and forcibly took him in a car and two autos to the house of Accused No.1, where he was wrongfully confined and physically assaulted, causing simple injuries. It is further alleged that, at the instigation of Accused No.1, Accused Nos.2 to 9 tied the hands and legs of the complainant to a boundary stone situated in front of the house of Accused No.1, again assaulted him, subjected him to extortion, and criminally intimidated him with dire consequences. Based on the report lodged by the complainant on 09.04.2026, the police registered the

crime and, during the course of investigation, collected material allegedly disclosing the involvement of the accused in the commission of the offences charged.

3. Sri Ponnayolu Sudhakar Reddy, learned Senior Counsel representing Sri J. Sudarshan Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner, submitted that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offences and has been falsely implicated in the case. He further submitted that the petitioner is the sole earning member of his family and, therefore, his continued incarceration would cause undue hardship to his dependents. It is contended that the petitioner undertakes to strictly adhere to any conditions that may be imposed by this Court.

4. The learned Senior Counsel further submitted that there is an unexplained delay of more than three years in lodging the complaint, which creates serious doubt regarding the veracity of the prosecution case. He argued that the allegations against the petitioner are general and omnibus in nature and that no specific overt act has been attributed to him. He also contended that the petitioner is a permanent resident of Pellakur Mandal, Tirupati District. He has got fixed abode, and that there is no likelihood of his absconding or tampering with the prosecution evidence. He further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and prayed that the petitioner be enlarged on bail.

5. *Per contra*, Mr.K.Sandeep, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner and submitted that there are specific allegations against him. He contended that the petitioner, along with the other accused, actively participated in kidnapping the de-facto complainant, wrongfully confining him, assaulting him, subjecting him to extortion, and criminally intimidating him at the instance of Accused No.1. He further submitted that the statements of the de-facto complainant and other witnesses recorded in the course of investigation clearly disclose the involvement of the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offences. There are sixteen cases pending against the petitioner. The learned Assistant Public Prosecutor argued that the offences are grave and serious in nature and that, if enlarged on bail, there is every likelihood of the petitioner influencing or threatening the prosecution witnesses and thereby hampering the trial. Therefore, he prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. Heard the learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor. Perused the record.

7. As seen from the record, the petitioner is alleged to have participated in the commission of the offences along with the other accused. The incident is stated to have occurred on 16.12.2023, whereas the report came to be lodged only on 09.04.2026. Thus, there is a substantial delay of more than three years in setting the criminal law into motion. The petitioner is arraigned as Accused No.1. The petitioner was arrested on execution of a P.T. Warrant on

20.04.2026. Ever since, he has been in judicial custody for the past 60 days. So far, six witnesses have been examined, and all of them are official witnesses. A substantial portion of the investigation has been completed. The learned Assistant Public Prosecutor submitted that there are sixteen similar criminal adverse antecedents reported against the petitioner.

8. Be that as it may, the Petitioner/Accused No.1 is presumed to be innocent until the guilt is proved. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Prabhakar Tewari v. State of Uttar Pradesh**<sup>1</sup>, at para No.7, observed that mere pendency of criminal antecedents itself is not a ground to deny the request for grant of bail.

9. The petitioner is a permanent resident of Pellakur Mandal, Tirupati District. He has got fixed abode. If the petitioner is enlarged on bail with stringent conditions, he may not venture to evade the process of law, threaten the witnesses, or tamper with the evidence.

10. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner/Accused No.1, and the unexplained delay in lodging the complaint, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner/Accused No.1 on bail, subject to certain stringent conditions.

11. In the result, the Criminal Petition is allowed with the following stringent conditions:

- i. The Petitioner/Accused No.1 shall be enlarged on bail subject to his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty

<sup>1</sup> (2020) 11 SCC 648

- Thousand only) with two sureties each for the like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Naidupeta.
- ii. The Petitioner/Accused No.1 shall appear before the Station House Officer concerned, on every Saturday in between 10:00 am and 05:00 pm, till filing of the charge sheet.
  - iii. The Petitioner/Accused No.1 shall not leave the limits of the State of Andhra Pradesh without prior permission from the Station House Officer concerned.
  - iv. The Petitioner/Accused No.1 shall not commit or indulge in commission of any offence in future.
  - v. The Petitioner/Accused No.1 shall cooperate with the investigating officer in further investigation of the case and shall make himself available for interrogation by the Investigating Officer as and when required.
  - vi. The Petitioner/Accused No.1 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 him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court.
  - vii. The petitioner/Accused No.1 shall surrender his passport, if any, to the investigating officer. If he claims that he does not

have passport, he shall submit an affidavit to that effect to the  
Investigating Officer.

SD/- U. SRIDEVI  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR  
SECTION OFFICER

//TRUE COPY//

To,

1. The Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Naidupeta.
2. The VII Additional Sessions Judge:: Gudur
3. The Superintendent, Central Jail, Nellore
4. The Station House Officer, Pellakuru Police Station, Tirupati District
5. One CC to SRI. Sudharsana Reddy J Advocate [OPUC]
6. Two CCs to Public Prosecutor, High Court of AP [OUT]
7. One spare copy

KJ

HIGH COURT

DR.YLR,J

DATED:19/06/2026

BAIL ORDER

CRLP.No.4520 of 2026

ALLOWED

