

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO(s). 825 OF 2005

ANNAREDDY CHINNA REDDY

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF A.P.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for bail and office report)

Date: 17/01/2006 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.N. AGRAWAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. MATHUR

For Appellant(s)

Mr. P.S. Narasimha, Adv.

Mr. Avijeet K Lala, Adv.

Mr. Gireesh Kumar, Adv.

Mr.Khwairakpam Nobin Singh,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Ms Sneha Bhaskaran, Adv.

Mrs.D. Bharathi Reddy,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The appeal is dismissed.

[Charanjeet Kaur]

Court Master

[Om Prakash]

Court Master

[Signed order is placed on the file]

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 825 OF 2005

Annareddy Chinna Reddy .. Appellant(s)
Versus
State of A.P. .. Respondent(s)

O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The appellant along with Dasareddigari Lakshmi Reddy and

Annareddy Rama Krishna was tried and by judgment rendered by the

trial Court, all of them were acquitted of the charges. When an

appeal was preferred against the order of acquittal by the State of

Andhra Pradesh, the High Court upheld acquittal of other two

accused persons whereas reversed the same in relation to the

appellant and he has been convicted under Section 302 of the Indian

Penal Code and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life. He has

been further convicted under Section 25(1)(a)(b) of the Arms Act,

1959 and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period

of three years and to pay fine of Rs. 1,000/-, in default, to undergo

simple imprisonment for a period of two months. The appellant

has

also been convicted under Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three years and to pay fine of Rs. 1,000/-, in default, to undergo further imprisonment for two months. The sentences, however, were ordered to run concurrently. Hence, this appeal.

We have been taken through the judgments rendered by the trial Court as well as the High Court and the evidence of the three eye-witnesses Yeddula Chalana Reddy (P.W.1), Annareddy Gopal Reddy (P.W.2) and Yeddula Venkata Lakshmi Reddy (P.W.3). The High Court reversed the order of acquittal as in its opinion, the same was perverse one. The High Court has given reasons for reversing the order of acquittal and placing reliance upon the evidence of the aforesaid three eye-witnesses. The evidence of the eye-witnesses is corroborated by the medical evidence. In our view, as the judgment rendered by the trial Court suffered from the vice of perversity, the High Court was quite justified in reversing the same. In view of these facts, we

are not inclined to interfere with the impugned order rendered by the High Court.

Accordingly, appeal fails and the same is dismissed.

.....J
[B.N. AGRAWAL]

.....J
[A.K. MATHUR]

NEW DELHI,

JANUARY 17, 2006.