



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI



THURSDAY, THE 10th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 6723, 6742 and 6733 of 2026

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos: 6723 of 2026.

Between:

1. Duddela Venkata Reddy alias Devudu, S/o Gali Reddy, aged about 51 years, R/o Pothampalli Village, Peddaraveedu Mandal, Markapuram District. (A6)
2. Duddela Koti Reddy, S/o Mallikarjuna Reddy, aged about 40 years, R/o Pothampalli Village, Peddaraveedu Mandal Markapuram District. (A-7)
3. Duddela Venkateswara Reddy, S/o Mallikarjuna Reddy, aged about 33 years R/o Pothampalli Village, Peddaraveedu Mandal, Markapuram District. (A-8)
4. Duddela Srinivasa Reddy, S/o Mallikarjuna Reddy, aged about 32 years, R/o Pothampalli Village, Peddaraveedu Mandal, Markapuram District. (A-9)

...Petitioners/Accused Nos. 6 to 9

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Amaravati.
- Respondent No.1
2. Chityala Rami Reddy, S/o Vengaiah, Aged 53, R/o. Hanuman Junction, Peddaraveedu Mandal, Markapuram District.

...Respondent No.2/De-facto Complainant

Petition under Sections 480 & 483 of BNSS (Old Sections 437 & 439 of Cr.P.C), is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court grant them Regular Bail in connection with Crime No. 61 of 2026 of Peddaraveedu Police Station, Markapuram District, in the interests of justice.

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos: 6742 of 2026.

Between:

1. Bhavanam Lakshmi Devi, W/o. Koti Reddy, Hindu, aged about 56 years, R/o. Gurijepalli Village, Yerragondapalem Mandal, Markapuram District.
2. Bochu Satyavathi alias Bhavanam Saraswathi, W/o. Ayyapu Reddy, Hindu, aged about 33 years, R/o. Gurijepalli Village, Yerragondapalem Mandal, Markapuram District.

...Petitioners/Accused Nos.4 and 5

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Amaravati.
2. Chityala Rami Reddy, S/o Vengaiah, Aged 53, R/o. Hanuman Junction, Peddaraveedu Mandal, Markapuram District.

Respondent No.1

...Respondent No.2/De-facto Complainant

Petition under Sections 480 & 483 of BNSS (Old Sections 437 & 439 of Cr.P.C), is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court grant Anticipatory Bail to them by directing the police to release them on bail in the event of their arrest in connection with Crime No. 61 of 2026 of Peddaraveedu Police Station, Markapuram District, in the interests of justice.

CRIMINAL PETITION Nos: 6733 of 2026.

Between:

1. Bhavanam Koti Reddy, S/o. Satyam Reddy, Hindu, aged about 43 years, R/o. Gurijepalli Village, Yerragondapalem Mandal, Markapuram District. (A-1)
2. Bhavanam Satyanarayana Reddy, S/o. Koti Reddy, Hindu, aged about 28 years, R/o. Gurijepalli Village, Yerragondapalem Mandal, Markapuram District. (A-2)
3. Kolli Srinivasa Reddy, S/o. Tirumala Reddy, Hindu, aged about 46 years, R/o. Gurijepalli Village, Yerragondapalem Mandal, Markapuram District. (A-3)

...Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 3

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Amaravati.

Respondent No.1

2. Chityala Rami Reddy, S/o Vengaiah, Aged 53, R/o. Hanuman Junction, Peddaraveedu Mandal, Markapuram District.

...Respondent No.2/De-facto Complainant

Petition under Sections 480 & 483 of BNSS (Old Sections 437 & 439 of Cr.P.C), is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court grant them Regular Bail in connection with Crime No. 61 of 2026 of Peddaraveedu Police Station, Markapuram District, in the interests of justice.

The Petition/Appeal coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and the affidavit filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of Dr MOJJADA RAMAKRISHNA Counsel for the Petitioners, PUBLIC PROSECUTOR Counsel for the Respondent, M/s. LEO LAW ASSOCIATES LLP Counsel for the Respondent and the Court made the following.

ORDER:



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

[3521]

THURSDAY, THE 10th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NOS: 6723, 6742 and 6733 of 2026

CRIMINAL PETITION NOS: 6723 of 2026

Between:

1. DUDDELA VENKATA REDDY ALIAS DEVUDU, S/O GALI REDDY, AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS, R/O POTHAMPALLI VILLAGE, PEDDARAVEEDU MANDAL, MARKAPURAM DISTRICT.
2. DUDDELA KOTI REDDY, S/O MALLIKARJUNA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS, R/O POTHAMPALLI VILLAGE, PEDDARAVEEDU MANDAL MARKAPURAM DISTRICT.
3. DUDDELA VENKATESWARA REDDY, S/O MALLIKARJUNA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS R/O POTHAMPALLI VILLAGE, PEDDARAVEEDU MANDAL, MARKAPURAM DISTRICT.
4. DUDDELA SRINIVASA REDDY, S/O MALLIKARJUNA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, R/O POTHAMPALLI VILLAGE, PEDDARAVEEDU MANDAL, MARKAPURAM DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
2. CHITYALA RAMI REDDY, S/O VENGAIAH, AGED 53, R/O. HANUMANJUNCTION, PEDDARAVEEDU MANDAL, MARKAPURAM DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT(S):

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 6742/2026**Between:**

1. BHAVANAM LAKSHMI DEVI, W/O. KOTI REDDY, HINDU, AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS, R/O. GURIJEPALLI VILLAGE, YERRAGONDAPALEMMANDAL, MARKAPURAMM DISTRICT.
2. BOCHU SATYAVATHI ALIAS BHAVANAM SARASWATHI, W/O. AYYAPU REDDY, HINDU, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, R/O. GURIJEPALLI VILLAGE, YERRAGONDAPALEM MANDAL, MARKAPURAM DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
2. CHITYALA RAMI REDDY, S/O VENGAI AH, AGED 53, R/O. HANUMAN JUNCTION, PEDDARAVEEDU MANDAL, MARKAPURAM DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT(S):**CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 6733/2026****Between:**

1. BHAVANAM KOTI REDDY, S/O. SATYAM REDDY, HINDU, AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS, R/O. GURIJEPALLI VILLAGE, YERRAGONDAPALEM MANDAL, MARKAPURAM DISTRICT.
2. BHAVANAM SATYANARAYANA REDDY, S/O. KOTI REDDY, HINDU, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, R/O. GURIJEPALLI VILLAGE, YERRAGONDAPALEM MANDAL, MARKAPURAM DISTRICT
3. KOLLI SRINIVASA REDDY, S/O. TIRUMALA REDDY, HINDU, AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS, R/O. GURIJEPALLI VILLAGE, YERRAGONDAPALEM MANDAL, MARKAPURAM DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PUBLIC

PRPSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.

2.CHITYALA RAMI REDDY, S/O VENGAIAH, AGED 53, R/O. HANUMANJUNCTION, PEDDARAVEEDUU MANDAL, MARKAPURAM DISTRICT.

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused(S):

1.Dr MOJJADA RAMAKRISHNA

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant(S):

1.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

2.LEO LAW ASSOCIATES LLP

The Court made the following:

COMMON ORDER:

These three Criminal Petitions are heard together and are being disposed of by this Common order, although the Petitioners in the three petitions are different, the crime registered against them is one and the same.

2. The Criminal Petition Nos.6723 & 6733 of 2026 have been filed under Sections 480 and 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNSS'), seeking to enlarge the Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 2 and 6 to 9 on bail in Crime No.61 of 2026 of Peddaraveedu Police Station, Markapuram District, registered for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 189(2), 191(2), 118(1), 329(3), and 324(4) read with 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNS').

3. Criminal Petition No.6742 of 2026 has been filed under Section 482 of 'the BNSS.,' by the Petitioners/Accused Nos.4 and 5 for granting of pre-arrest bail in connection with the very same Crime No.61 of 2026 of Peddaraveedu Police Station.

4. The case of the prosecution, in nutshell, that, on 12.07.2026 at about 09.30 hours, the complainant and his family members were overseeing the construction of a boundary wall in Ac.0.32 cents of land in Survey No.4/3A of Hanuman Junction Kunta Village, Peddaraveedu Mandal. It is alleged that the accused persons, forming themselves into an unlawful assembly, criminally trespassed into the land, damaged the boundary wall, picked up a quarrel with the complainant and his family members and assaulted them with sticks and stones. In the said incident, the complainant and two others sustained bleeding and swelling injuries. On hearing their cries, nearby persons intervened and rescued them.

5. Mr.M.S.S.S.Prakash Babu, learned Counsel, appearing on behalf of Sri Dr Mojjada Ramakrishna, the learned Counsel for the Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 3 and 6 to 9 submits that the dispute between the parties is essentially civil in nature relating to land in Sy.No.4/3A and has been given a criminal colour. A counter case in Crime No.62 of 2026 has also been registered against the complainant party, and both sides sustained only simple injuries, indicating a free fight. Petitioner No.4 has already instituted a civil suit and obtained an ad-interim injunction in respect of the disputed property. The injuries suffered by the witnesses are simple in nature and the ingredients of Sections 109(1) and 308 of 'the BNS.,' are not attracted. The Petitioners voluntarily appeared before the police and cooperated with the investigation. The investigation has substantially progressed and no further custodial interrogation is required. The Petitioners have been in judicial custody since

16/17.07.2026. They are permanent residents, have no criminal antecedents, and there is no likelihood of their absconding or tampering with evidence. Petitioner No.2 is pursuing a Ph.D. at IIT Kharagpur and his continued detention would adversely affect his academic career. Hence, it is urged to allow the Criminal Petitions.

6. The learned Counsel for the Petitioners/Accused Nos.4 and 5 further submits the Petitioners/Accused Nos.4 and 5 are innocent women aged about 56 years and 33 years respectively, and have been falsely implicated in Crime No.61 of 2026 arising out of a long-standing civil dispute relating to land in Sy.No.4/3A. There are no specific overt acts attributed to the Petitioners and that the allegations against them are vague and omnibus in nature. The learned counsel further submits that the investigation has substantially progressed, material witnesses have been examined, and no custodial interrogation of the women Petitioners is required. The Petitioners are permanent residents of the locality, have no criminal antecedents, and are ready to cooperate with the investigation and abide by any conditions imposed by the Court. It is therefore prayed that, in the event of their arrest, the Petitioners be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

7. *Per contra*, Mr.A. Sai Rohit, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor vehemently opposed the grant of bail to the Petitioners, submitting that the investigation is still underway and several material witnesses remain to be examined. It is contended that if the Petitioners are released on bail at this stage, there is a strong likelihood that they may abscond, thereby hampering

the ongoing investigation and evading the process of law. Hence, it is urged to dismiss the Criminal Petitions.

8. The learned Assistant Public Prosecutor further submits, vehemently opposed the grant of pre-arrest bail to the Petitioners/Accused Nos.4 and 5, submitting that the investigation is still underway and several material witnesses remain to be examined. It is contended that if the Petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, there is a strong likelihood that they may abscond, thereby hampering the ongoing investigation and evading the process of law. Hence, it is urged to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

9. Sri Venkateswarlu Gadipudi, learned Counsel for Respondent No.2 submits that the investigation is still in progress and that several material witnesses are yet to be examined. It was further contended that, if the Petitioners are enlarged on bail at this stage, there is a reasonable apprehension that they may abscond, thereby obstructing the ongoing investigation and evading the due process of law. On these grounds, the learned Counsel for Respondent No.2 urges for dismissal of the Criminal Petitions.

10. Learned Counsel for Respondent No.2 vehemently opposed the grant of pre-arrest bail to the Petitioners/Accused Nos.4 and 5 and submits that the investigation is still in progress and that several material witnesses are yet to be examined. It is further contended that, in the event the Petitioners are granted anticipatory bail at this stage, there is a strong possibility of their absconding, which may adversely affect the ongoing investigation and enable

them to evade the process of law. Hence, it is urged to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

11. Thoughtful consideration is bestowed on the arguments advanced by the learned Counsel for both sides. I have perused the entire record.

12. In the light of the case of the prosecution and the contentions of the learned Counsel for both the sides, now the point for consideration is:

"Whether the Petitioners/Accused Accused Nos.1 to 2 and 6 to 9 are entitled for grant of regular bail?"

"Whether the Petitioners/Accused Accused Nos.4 and 5 are entitled for grant of pre-arrest bail?"

13. As borne out by the record, Accused No. 3 has already been granted temporary bail *vide* order dated 31.08.2026. Accused No. 3 is a student pursuing his studies at IIT Kharagpur. The Petitioners/Accused were arrested on 17.07.2026 and have been in judicial custody for the past 55 days. So far, twelve witnesses have been examined. It is alleged that there was a free fight between two groups, pursuant to which case and counter-cases came to be registered. With regard to allegations against the Petitioner/Accused Nos.4 and 5. They are bald and omnibus in nature. They are females aged about 56 and 33 years respectively. They are permanent residents of Yerragondapalem Mandal, Markapuram District. They have got fixed abode.

14. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of allegations levelled against the Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 3 and 6 to 9, this Court is inclined to enlarge the Petitioners/Accused Nos. 1 to 3

and 6 to 9 on bail and Petitioners/Accused Nos.4 and 5 on pre-arrest bail with some stringent conditions.

15. In the result, the Criminal Petitions are allowed with the following stringent conditions:

- i. The Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 3 and 6 to 9 shall be enlarged on bail subject to their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only) with two sureties for the like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Judicial Magistrate of I Class, Markapur.
- ii. In the event of their arrest, the Petitioners/Accused Nos.4 and 5 shall be enlarged on bail subject to her executing a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties for the like sum each to the satisfaction of the arresting police officials.
- iii. The Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 9 and their sureties shall furnish their permanent residential address details and identity particulars to the concerned police and keep the police informed about the change in address, if any, time to time.
- iv. The Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 3 and 6 to 9 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.
- v. The Petitioners/Accused Nos.4 and 5 shall make themselves available for investigation as and when required.
- vi. The Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 9 shall not commit or indulge in commission of any offence in future.
- vii. The Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 3 and 6 to 9 shall cooperate with the Investigating Officer in further

investigation of the case and shall make themselves available for interrogation by the Investigating Officer as and when required.

- viii. The Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 9 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.
- ix. The Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 9 shall surrender their passports, if any, to the investigating officer. If they claim that they do not have passports, they shall submit affidavits to that effect to the Investigating Officer.

SD/- U.SRIDEVI
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
SECTION OFFICER

//TRUE COPY//

To,

1. The VI Additional District & Sessions Judge, Markapur.
2. The Additional Judicial Magistrate of I Class, Markapur.
3. The Superintendent, Sub Jail, Markapur, Prakasam District.
4. The Station House Officer, Peddaraveedu Police Station, Markapuram District.
5. Chityala Rami Reddy, S/o Vengaiah, Aged 53, R/o. Hanuman Junction, Peddaraveedu Mandal, Markapuram District.
6. Chityala Rami Reddy, S/o Vengaiah, Aged 53, R/o. Hanuman Junction, Peddaraveedu Mandal, Markapuram District.
7. One CC to SRI. Dr MOJJADA RAMAKRISHNA Advocate [OPUC]
8. One CC to SRI. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR Advocate [OPUC]
9. One CC to SRI. LEO LAW ASSOCIATES LLP Advocate [OPUC]
10. One spare copy.

TVSR

HIGH COURT

DR.YLR,J

DATED:10/09/2026.

BAIL ORDER

CRLP NO. 6723 OF 2026

ALLOWED

