

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGSWrit Petition(s) (Civil) No(s). 234/2026

SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH & ORS.

Respondent(s)

Date : 23-02-2026 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHIFor Petitioner(s) : Mr. Rajshekhar Rao, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Navneet R., AOR
Mr. Ajay Sabharwal, Adv.
Ms. Alankrita Sinha, Adv.For Respondent(s) : Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Aggarwal, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Prerna Singh, Adv.
Mr. Guntur Pramod Kumar, AOR

Mr. Kavın Gulati, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Guntur Prabhakar, AOR
Mr. Keshav Singh, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. The instant Writ Petition under Article 32 of the Constitution has been filed seeking an order to restrain the State of Andhra Pradesh from interfering in the investigation directed by this Court in another Writ Petition, which was also filed by the petitioner.

2. The controversy pertains to the alleged adulteration of Ghee used in the preparation of *Prasadam Laddus* at Tirumala. In the past, some statements were made claiming that the sanctity of

Prasadam was compromised/tampered with by using adulterated Ghee, etc. This led to the registration of FIR No. 470/2024 on 25.09.2024. Eventually, the investigation of that FIR has been entrusted to a Special Investigation Team comprising the officers/agencies mentioned in paragraph 9 of the order dated 04.10.2024, passed by this Court in W.P. (Civil) No.622/2024. That investigation is complete, and the chargesheet and supplementary chargesheet have been filed. However, the matter is still *sub judice*.

3. Meanwhile, the State Government appears to have also directed an administrative inquiry to identify the: (i) lapses, if any, (ii) nature of lapses, (iii) persons responsible for such lapses, and (iv) consequences of such lapses. Such an administrative inquiry, in our considered opinion, cannot be termed as overlapping with the criminal proceedings, which have culminated into filing of a chargesheet/supplementary chargesheet. There being no conflict of interest, no overlapping, and the scope of investigation/inquiry having been well demarcated, we are satisfied that the apprehension expressed by the petitioner in the instant writ petition lacks sufficient foundation. Let both processes continue strictly in accordance with the law.

4. With that clarification, the writ petition stands disposed of with pending application(s), if any.

(NITIN TALREJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI T.C.)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR