

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. SHANKAR NARAYANA

CRIMINAL PETITION No.3876 OF 2017

ORDER:

The present Criminal Petition is filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, requesting to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner - accused No.2 viz., Karreddula Vijay Kumar alias Vinay in Crime No.46 of 2017 of Abids Road Police Station, Hyderabad, for the offences punishable under Sections 402 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860.

2. In fact, Smt. Vasundhara Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner, has advanced arguments on 07.07.2017, and at request of the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State of Andhra Pradesh, it was adjourned to this day and, today, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted his arguments.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor resists the request of the petitioner on the ground that he is brother of accused No.1, working in Chief Commissioner of Land Administration (Revenue Department) (CCLA) and taking advantage of his position in CCLA, impressed upon the petitioner that he would be provided a job in CCLA stating that there was vacancy of Senior Assistant post in the said office and that he would get posting orders within sixty (60) days and demanded for

payment of Rs.36,00,000/- and an amount of Rs.10,00,000/- was already paid and Rs.26,00,000/- was paid through cheque and thereafter, they evaded to reply to the *de facto* complainant. The petitioner, on the premise that he is a Government employee in CCLA, requests for grant of anticipatory bail. Such an attempt made by him before the Court below proved unsuccessful since his request in Criminal M.P. No.1026 of 2017 was rejected by the order dated 13.04.2017.

4. It is no doubt true, the learned counsel for the petitioner contended that there was no connection between both the accused though, the petitioner is brother of accused No.1 and he is absolutely unaware of the alleged promise between the *de facto* complainant and accused No.1

5. On a perusal of the material papers, more particularly, when the complaint allegations would clearly point out the petitioner herein sharing the amount paid by the *de facto* complainant, certainly, the request for grant of anticipatory bail cannot be acceded to.

6. Therefore, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

A. SHANKAR NARAYANA, J

July 11, 2017.

PV