

APHC010723312025



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

[3396]

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

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 29/2026

Between:

KADURU CHINNAPPA, S/O LATE CHINNA RAO, HINDU, AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS, OCC FORMER SPECIAL OFFICER, ANDHRA PRADESH BHAWAN, GOVT, OF ANDHRA PRADESH, R/O. 1-36, COLONY, PAMULAVALASA, VIZIANAGARAM DISTRICT CAUSE TITLE OF THE PETITIONER IS AMENDED AS PER THE COURT ORDER DATED 20.01.2026 IN I.A.NO.1 OF 2026 IN CRL.P.NO.29 OF 2026.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTOR HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI THROUGH INVESTIGATION OFFICER, SPECIAL INVESTIGATION TERAMSIT ADDITIONAL SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE ADMINTIRUPATI.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused:

1. UDAY KUMAR VAMPUGADAVALA

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant:

1. P S P SURESH KUMAR, SPL. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR FOR CBI

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

This Criminal Petition under Sections 480 and 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS'), has been filed by the Petitioner / Accused No.24, seeking regular bail in connection with Crime No.470 of 2024 of Tirupati East Police Station, Tirupati District registered for the offences under Sections 274, 275, 316(5), 318(3), 318(4), 61(2), 299

read with 49 read with 3(5) of BNS and Sections 51 and 59 of Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 (for short 'FSS Act').

2. It is alleged against the Petitioner / Accused No.24 that, while he was working as P.A to Y.V.Subba Reddy, who acted as Chairman, TTD from 2019-2023, involved in larger conspiracy relating to the alleged supply of adulterated ghee to Tirumala Tirupathi Devasthanam, demanded and collected illegal gratification from the Dairies.

3. Heard Sri C.Nageswara Rao, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Sri V.Uday Kumar, learned counsel for the Petitioner and Sri P.S.P.Suresh Kumar, learned Special Public Prosecutor for CBI.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged. It is submitted that the earlier bail application filed by the Petitioner was dismissed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in CrI.P.No.12357 of 2025, dated 15.12.2025 on the ground that the investigation into the alleged role of the Petitioner was at a crucial stage. It is further submitted that, so far, 48 witnesses have been examined, the investigation with regard to the Petitioner has been completed and charge sheet has also been filed. Learned Senior Counsel would submit that the Petitioner has been in judicial custody from 29.10.2025 and the statements of the witnesses *prima facie* disclose that further custodial interrogation of the Petitioner is not required in this matter. It is further submitted that cognizance of offences is yet to be taken in the present crime. Learned

Senior Counsel would submit that there is no necessity for further custody of the Petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, Learned Special Public Prosecutor for CBI would submit that the Petitioner involved in grave and serious offences. Learned Special Public Prosecutor would further submit that, the investigation so far done, would reveal the role of the Petitioner in the alleged crime. It is further submitted that the statements of the witnesses i.e., Sri Kailash Chand Mangla and Sri P.P.Srinivasan confirmed the alleged demand of illegal gratification by the Petitioner. It is further submitted that, the Petitioner is an influential person and hence, there is a reasonable and well-founded apprehension that, if he is enlarged on bail, there is every possibility of influencing or threatening the prosecution witnesses. In support of his contentions, reliance has been placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Kalyan Chandra Sarkar vs. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav and another**¹. Learned Special Public Prosecutor would finally submit that, no case is made out for grant of bail to the Petitioner. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions and perused the material placed on record. The rejection of the earlier bail application was primarily on the ground that the investigation was at a crucial stage. Admittedly, the investigation has been completed, the charge sheet has been filed and a substantial number of witnesses have already been examined.

¹ (2004) 7 SCC 528

The Petitioner has been in judicial custody for a considerable period, and at this stage, further custodial interrogation does not appear to be necessary. While the allegations against the Petitioner are serious, the apprehension expressed by the prosecution regarding influencing of witnesses can be addressed by imposing stringent conditions.

7. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, and having regard to the completion of investigation, the period of custody already undergone, this Court is of the view that the Petitioner can be enlarged on bail subject to the following stringent conditions.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is allowed and the Petitioner shall be released on bail, subject to the following conditions:

- (i) The Petitioner / Accused No.24 shall execute a personal bond for a sum of ₹1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) with two sureties for a like sum each, to the satisfaction of the trial Court;
- (ii) The Petitioner / Accused No.24 shall surrender his passport, if any, before the trial Court and shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court;
- (iii) The Petitioner / Accused No.24 shall not leave the limits of the State without giving intimation to the Investigating Officer. The Investigating Agency shall furnish their Whatsapp mobile number to the Petitioner / Accused No.24 for the purpose of convenience.
- (iv) The Petitioner / Accused No.24 shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required and shall cooperate with further investigation, if any.
- (v) The Petitioner / Accused No.24 shall not directly or indirectly tamper with evidence nor influence, intimidate, or induce any prosecution witness.

- (vi) The Petitioner / Accused No.24 shall not contact any of the prosecution witnesses or co-accused, except during legal proceedings.
- (vii) The Petitioner / Accused No.24 shall file his affidavit before the trial Court disclosing all his movable and immovable properties, bank accounts, *demat* accounts, business interests, and financial holdings, whether held individually or jointly within a period of two weeks from the date of his release.
- (viii) The Petitioner / Accused No.24 shall not make or publish or disseminate any information, statement, or post whether in print, electronic or social media concerning the present crime till conclusion of the trial.
- (ix) The Petitioner / Accused No.24 shall not alienate, encumber, or create third-party interests in any property disclosed by him or identified by the prosecution, without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (x) The Petitioner / Accused No.24 shall not operate or manage any company, firm, or bank account alleged to have been used in connection with the offence, except with prior intimation to the Investigating Agency.
- (xi) The Petitioner / Accused No.24 shall furnish his active mobile number to the Investigating Officer and shall be available at all times and any change shall be intimated forthwith.
- (xii) The Petitioner / Accused No.24 shall appear before the Investigating Agency once in a week i.e., on every Saturday between 10.00 a.m. and 5.00 p.m. till further orders.

In the event of violation of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

Dr.JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.29 of 2026

Dated:05.02.2026

Dinesh