

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

THURSDAY, THE SIXTH DAY OF NOVEMBER,

TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 11135 OF 2025



Between:

Gara Sateesh Kumar, S/o. Kondayya, aged 29 years, Employee in Army, R/o. D. No. 3-84, Mandarada Village, Santhakaviti Mandal, Vizianagaram District.

Petitioner/Accused

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Through Station House Officer, Santhakaviti PS, Vizianagaram District, Represented by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amaravati.

2. Dasari Meri, D/o. Prasad, 29 years, Medical Health Department, Mandarada Village, Visakhapatnam.

(R2 is impleaded as per the Court Order dated. 06/11/2025 in CrI.P.No. 11135/2025)

Respondent/Complainant

Petition under Section 482 of BNSS., is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the grounds filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner in the event of his arrest in connection with Crime No. 88 of 2025 of Santhakaviti Police Station, Vizianagaram.

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and the affidavit filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of Sri. MAHESH ADAVIVARAPU, Advocate for the Petitioner and of PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, for the Respondent;

The Court made the following ORDER:

The victim is not impleaded as Respondent No.2 in this case. The victim/de-facto complainant is impleaded as Respondent No.2 in this case as per the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Jagjeet Singh and Others v. Ashish Mishra¹.

Learned Counsel for the Petitioner is permitted to take out personal notice on the victim and file proof to that effect.

Heard the learned Counsel for the Petitioner and the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor.

The Petitioner is aged about 29 years, the victim is also aged about 29 years. They had for some time love affair, and they were in physical contact. Later Respondent No.2 became pregnant. The Petitioner allegedly had not kept his promise of marrying the de-facto complainant/victim.

Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the reason for Petitioner not marrying the de-facto complainant is that she is maintaining relationship with another man.

Considering the facts and circumstances of this case, there shall not be any coercive steps be taken against the Petitioner, but the Petitioner shall cooperate with the Investigating Officer. The Investigating Officer may proceed with further investigation.

Post after four weeks.

Sd/- U.Sridevi
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Station House Officer, Santhakaviti Police Station, Vizianagaram.
2. Dasari Meri, D/o. Prasad, 29 years, Medical Health Department, Mandarada Village, Visakhapatnam. (BY RPAD)
3. One CC to Sri. MAHESH ADAVIVARAPU, Advocate [OPUC]
4. Two CCs to PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Amaravati. [OUT]
5. One spare copy

HIGH COURT

DR.YLR, J

DATED:06/11/2025

POST AFTER FOUR WEEKS.

ORDER

CRLP.No.11135 of 2025

DIRECTION

