

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

C R I M I N A L A P P E A L N O (s) . 6 9 7 O F 2 0 0 7

STATE OF A.P.

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

P.RAMAKRISHNA

Respondent(s)

Date: 18/02/2010 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARJIT SINGH BEDI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.S. THAKUR

For Appellant(s)

Mr. I. Venkat Narayan, Sr. Adv.
Mrs.D. Bharathi Reddy, Adv.
Ms. Anuradha Rustagi, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. P.P.Rao, Sr. Adv
Mr. Guntur Prabhakar, Adv.
Mr. Purushottam S.T, Adv.
Mr. Utsav Sidhu, Adv.
Ms. Sampriti Phukan, Adv.
Ms. Filza Moonis, Adv.

U P O N h e a r i n g c o u n s e l t h e C o u r t m a d e t h e f o l l o w i n g
O R D E R

The Appeal is dismissed.

(Madhu Bala- II)
SR. P.A.

(R.K.Sharma)
COURT MASTER

The signed order is placed on the file.
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

C R I M I N A L A P P E A L N O . 6 9 7 O F 2 0 0 7

STATE OF A.P.

.. APPELLANT(S)

vs.

P. RAMAKRISHNA

.. RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

The primary reason for the reversal of the findings of conviction by the High Court was that the Deputy Superintendent of Police of the Anti Corruption Bureau and the Inspector who had investigated the case had not been examined and that the explanation tendered by the accused that the Rs.500/- taken by him represented his fee for private consultation, which was duly authorized to him.

As the fact have been examined threadbare by the High Court in favour of the accused, we are not inclined to interfere in this matter.

The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

.....J.
(HARJIT SINGH BEDI)

.....J.
(T.S. THAKUR)

New Delhi,
February 18, 2010.