

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI**

**FRIDAY, THE TWENTY SIXTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER,**

**TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

**:PRESENT:**

**THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO**

**CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 9995 OF 2025**



**Between:**

Arumalla Naga Praneeth Kumar, S/o Koti Ratna Lakshmi Varaprasad,  
Hindu, aged 32 years, N/o Bandlamitta, Ongole, presently residing at 9th  
phase, Kukatpally, Hyderabad, represented by his Wife Telaprolu Aswani.

**...Petitioner/A-4**

**AND**

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of  
A.P., Amaravati, Guntur District, through the State SHO, Ongole Taluk  
Police Station, Prakasam District, Andhra Pradesh.

**...Respondent/Complainant**

Petition under Section 480 & 483 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.4 on bail in Crime No. 434/2025, dated 09/07/2025 on the file of Taluk  
Police Station, Prakasam District registered under Sections 61(2), 318(2),  
336(3), 340(2), 338 r/w 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023;

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and  
the memorandum of grounds of criminal petition and upon hearing the  
arguments of Sri Jada Sravan Kumar, Advocate for the Petitioner and  
Public Prosecutor for the Respondent, the Court made the following;



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

[3521]

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY SIXTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 9995 OF 2025

**Between:**

1. ARUMALLA NAGA PRANEETH KUMAR, S/O KOTI RATNA LAKSHMI  
VARAPRASAD, HINDU, AGED 32 YEARS, N/O BANDLAMITTA,  
ONGOLE, PRESENTLY RESIDING AT 9TH PHASE, KUKATPALLY,  
HYDERABAD, REPRESENTED BY HIS WIFE TELAPROLU ASWANI.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, rep by its Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of A.P., Amaravati, Guntur District, through the State SHO,  
Ongole Taluk Police Station, Prakasam District, Andhra Pradesh.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

**Counsel for the Petitioner/accused:**

1. JADA SRAVAN KUMAR

**Counsel for the Respondent/complainant:**

1. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

**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.4 on bail in Crime No. 434 of 2025 of  
Ongole Taluka Police Station, Prakasam District, registered against the

Petitioner/Accused No.4 herein for the offence punishable under Sections 61(2), 318(2), 336(3), 340(2), 338 read with 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, (for brevity 'the BNS').

CASE OF THE PROSECUTION:

2. Material averments stemming from the prosecution are that prior to 09.07.2025 the Accused informed her and colony dwellers that if open the savings account and hand over the ATM card and bank account books, they will give Rs. 6,000/-. Similarly, if it is current account they will give Rs. 1,000/-. After 20 days they will be given their sim card, ATM card and bank books. Later they came to know that the Accused are doing business on the name of Madina tailor and created fake documents and used the same as genuine and gave the same in the bank and opened the account in the Indian Overseas Bank. After two days, they told them that they required signatures on the white papers and she got suspicion and informed the same to her husband. At that time her son and husband asked the Accused, but they did not give proper answer and picked up quarrel. Hence the above case.

CONTENTIONS OF THE COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER:

3. Sri Jada Sravan Kumar, learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the alleged offence, and that there is no *prima facie* material or cogent evidence connecting the Petitioner to the commission of the crime. It is further contended that the Petitioner is the sole earning member of his family and that

his incarceration would result in grave hardship and irreparable prejudice to his dependents. The Petitioner undertakes to comply with any condition that this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper to impose while considering the prayer for grant of bail.

4. It is further submitted that the Petitioner is a permanent resident of Kukatpally, Hyderabad and there exists no apprehension of his absconding or evading the due process of law. The Petitioner has extended full cooperation in the course of investigation and undertakes to continue such cooperation in all future proceedings. It is also urged that the nature of the allegations does not necessitate custodial interrogation, and that the imposition of appropriate conditions would suffice to secure the ends of justice. In view of the foregoing, it is urged to allow the petition.

ARGUMENTS OF THE STATE:

5. *Per contra*, Ms. P. Akhila Naidu, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail. The prosecution further raises an apprehension that, if released, the Petitioner may exert undue influence upon, or intimidate, prosecution witnesses, thereby impeding the administration of justice and vitiating the evidentiary foundation of the case. It is also contended that there exists a palpable and imminent risk of the Petitioner absconding, thereby frustrating the due process of law.

6. In view of the gravity and allegations, coupled with the potential threat posed to the integrity of the investigation, it is submitted that the Petitioner is

not entitled to the indulgence of discretionary relief and it is urged to dismiss the present Criminal Petition.

POINT FOR CONSIDERATION:

7. In view of the rival submissions advanced by both the learned Counsel and upon a perusal of the prosecutorial narrative, the pivotal issue now meriting for consideration is:

*“Whether the Petitioner is entitled for grant of bail?”*

ANALYSIS:

8. Learned VII Additional District and Sessions Judge, Ongole has granted regular bail to the Accused No.1 to 3 on 19.09.2025 in CrI.M.P.No.886 of 2025 in Crime No.434 of 2025 of Ongole Taluk Police Station. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor would submit that the investigation is completed, except arrest of Accused No.5, 6 and 14 is pending. The Petitioner was arrested on 23.07.2025. He has been in judicial custody for the past 60 days.

CONCLUSION:

9. Considering the progress of the investigation, nature and gravity of allegation levelled against the Petitioner, his alleged role played in this case, and the period of detention undergone by the Petitioner, this Court is inclined to enlarge the Petitioner on bail with the following stringent conditions:

- i. The Petitioner/Accused No.4 shall be enlarged on bail subject to his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees

twenty thousand only), with two sureties each for the like sum each to the satisfaction of the III Additional Musif Magistrate, Ongole.

ii. The Petitioner/Accused No.4 shall appear before the Station House Officer, Ongole Taluk Police Station, Prakasam District, on every Saturday in between 10:00 am and 05:00 pm, till cognizance is taken by the learned the Trial Court.

iii. The Petitioner/Accused No.4 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.4 shall not commit or indulge in commission of any offence in future.

v. The Petitioner/Accused No.4 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.4 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 or to any police officer.


vii. The Petitioner/Accused No.4 shall surrender his passport, if any, to the investigating officer. If he claims that he does not

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

10. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed.

//TRUE COPY//

For

SD/- U. SRIDEVI  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR  
  
SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The III Additional Munsif Magistrate, Ongole.
2. The Superintendent, Ongole Sub-Jail, Prakasam District
3. The Station House Officer, Ongole Taluk Police Station, Prakasam District, Andhra Pradesh.
4. One CC to Sri. Jada Sravan Kumar, Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CCs to Public Prosecutor, High Court of AP [OUT]
6. One spare copy

MM

**HIGH COURT**

**Dr.YLR,J**

**DATED:26/09/2025**

**ORDER**

**CRLP.No.9995 of 2025**

**ALLOWED**

