



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

[3396]

THURSDAY, THE TWELFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 1203/2025

Between:

1.KAMAPU REDDY SEKHAR REDDY, S/O ANAND REDDY,AGED
ABOUT 29 YEARS,R/O KARNAPUDPANDILAPALLE,RAMAPURAM
MANDAL.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, Rep. by SHO, Ibrahimpatnam
Police Station, through Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra
Pradesh, Amaravati.

...RESPONDENT

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 allow the Revision Petition by setting
aside the Order dt.29-07-2025 passed in CrI.M.P.No.903/2025 in
Cr.No.246/2024 on the file of Hon'ble Rent Controller-cum-IV Additional Civil
Judge (Junior Division)-cum-I V Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class,
Vijayawada by allowing the said petition and pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.A SYAM SUNDAR REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent:

1.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA**CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 1203/2025****JUDGMENT:**

The present Criminal Revision Case has been filed, challenging the Order dated 29.07.2025 passed by the learned Rent Controller-cum-IV Additional Civil Judge (Junior Division)-cum-IV Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Vijayawada in CrI.M.P.No.903 of 2025 in Cr.No.246 of 2024.

2. Heard Mr. A.Syam Sundar Reddy, learned counsel for the Petitioner/Accused No.2 and Mrs.K.Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor on behalf of the State.

3. The Petitioner herein is the Accused No.2 in Cr.No.246 of 2024 of Ibrahimpatnam Police Station, Vijayawada. He was granted bail by the Trial Court in CrI.M.P.No.771 of 2024 on 29.05.2024 with the condition to appear before the SHO concerned on every Saturday. Subsequently, he sought partial relaxation, which was allowed in CrI.M.P.No.1067 of 2024 on 07.08.2024, directing him to appear only on the 1st and 3rd Saturdays of every month. Thereafter, his petition for further relaxation in CrI.M.P.No.903 of 2025 was dismissed on 29.07.2025. Aggrieved by the same, he filed the present revision.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner would submit that the petitioner has been diligently complying with all the terms and conditions imposed by the Court and has been cooperating fully with the investigation. He further submits

that the movable and immovable properties involved in the case are frozen, and the investigation is substantially completed. The petitioner, being a resident of Kadapa, has to travel to Ibrahimpatnam, which involves two days of travel. The learned Trial Court, while dismissing the petition, did not take into account the health conditions of the petitioner's wife and minor child. Since the petitioner's presence is just and necessary, recurrent visits to the police station make it difficult for his wife to manage their son's medical needs. He finally prays to set aside the impugned order.

5. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the revision and submits that the learned Trial Judge rightly passed the impugned order. The order is well-reasoned and based on a careful consideration of the petitioner's request, and therefore does not warrant interference by this Court. The learned Judge had already granted a significant concession by modifying the original condition of weekly appearance to fortnightly. She further submits that the petitioner has not shown any new or material change in circumstances since the earlier modification, and no exceptional grounds exist to justify further relaxation of the bail conditions. In these circumstances, the revision deserves to be dismissed.

6. Considering the submissions and a fair look at the material placed on record, it is evident that the learned Trial Judge carefully balanced the petitioner's convenience with the requirements of the ongoing investigation. The order is well-reasoned, and there is no illegality or infirmity in the exercise of judicial discretion. The petitioner has failed to demonstrate any exceptional

circumstances that would warrant further modification of the bail conditions. This Court is of the view that there is no merit in the revision petition. The impugned order passed by the learned Trial Court is well-reasoned, legally sound, and does not warrant any interference of this Court.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision case is dismissed, confirming the Order dated 29.07.2025 passed by the learned Rent Controller-cum-IV Additional Civil Judge (Junior Division)-cum-IV Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Vijayawada in CrI.M.P.No.903 of 2025 in Cr.No.246 of 2024.

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

DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Date: 12.02.2026.
UPS

209

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 1203/2025

Dt.12.02.2026

UPS