

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl) No(s).4262/2011

(From the judgement and order dated 03/12/2010 in CRLA No.637/2007, of The HIGH COURT OF A.P AT HYDERABAD)

KAMBALAPALLI RANGA REDDY

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF A.P.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for exemption from filing c/c of the impugned Judgment,bail and for raising the additional plea of juvenile with affidavit and office report ))

WITH SLP(Crl) NO. 4281 of 2011

(With appln(s) for exemption from filing c/c of the impugned Judgment,bail and for raising the additional plea of juvenile with affidavit and office report )

SLP(Crl) NO. 4311 of 2011

(With appln(s) for exemption from filing c/c of the impugned Judgment,bail and for raising the additional plea of juvenile with affidavit and office report ))

SLP(Crl) NO. 4329 of 2011

(With appln(s) for exemption from filing c/c of the impugned Judgment,bail and for raising the additional plea of juvenile with affidavit and office report ))

SLP(Crl) NO. 8482 of 2011

(With appln(s) for exemption from filing c/c of the impugned Judgment,bail and for raising the additional plea of juvenile with affidavit and office report ))

Date: 10/07/2013 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.S. THAKUR  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGDISH SINGH KHEHAR

For Petitioner(s) Mr. V.Sridhar Reddy, Adv.  
Ch. Leela Sarveswar, Adv.  
Mr. Vineet Misra, Adv.  
Mr. V.N. Raghupathy,Adv.

Ms. Asha Gopalan Nair  
Mr. Abhishek Kumar Pandey, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. ATM.Rangaramanujam, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. D. Mahesh Babu,Adv.  
Mr. Mayur R.Shah, Adv.  
Mr. Amjid Maqbool, Adv.  
MS. Suhitra, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

A report has been received from the Juvenile Justice Board, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh. Mr. ATM. Rangaramanujam, learned senior counsel appearing for respondent-State seeks a short adjournment to examine the report and file his objections. Mr. Rangaramanujam argued that the report submitted by Juvenile Justice Board may not be tenable in law as the inquiry conducted by the Board was ex-parte as much as no opportunity was given to the respondent-State to cross-examine the witnesses whose depositions were recorded by the Board in the course of inquiry. He is unable to state as to whether the State is represented by prosecuting officer or presenting officer before the Board. He sought time to take instructions on that aspect also.

Post after three weeks. Objections, if any, may be filed by learned counsel for the petitioners. Instructions may also be taken by Mr. Rangaramanujam as to the person who presents the prosecution version before the Juvenile Justice Board.

| (Shashi Sareen)  
| Court Master

| | (Veena Khara)  
| | Court Master

|