APHC010046492026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI [3521]
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE 6th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 231/2026

Between:

G VAMSI CHAKRADHAR, S/O LATE KRISHNAMURTHY, AGED 43 YEARS, R/O D.NO.50-46-5/3, PNT COLONY, SEETHAMMADHARA, VISHAKAPATANAM- 530013.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. THROUGH ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTOR HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATHI-522239.
2. G SAILAJA, W/O. VAMSI CHAKRADHAR, AGED 35 YEARS, R/O. D.NO.5-6-59/88/7A SHAKTHI INDUSTRIES, CHURCH ROAD, LAMBODIPETA, VIJAYAWADA- 520001.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

G V SHIVAJI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The Criminal Revision Case has been filed under Sections 438 & 442 of

the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity, 'the BNSS') challenging the interlocutory order dated 07.07.2025 in Crl.M.P.No.205 of 2022 in M.C.No.1 of 2014 passed by the learned Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Amalapuram.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the Petitioner and the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor. Perused the record.

3. The order impugned, dated 07.07.2025, admittedly, interlocutory in nature. Aggrieved by the said order, the Petitioner has preferred the present Revision Case.

4. Indeed, a revision against interlocutory order is not maintainable as per Section 397(2) of 'the Cr.P.C.' The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Sethuraman v. Rajamanickam**[1], **Bhaskar Industries Ltd. v. Bhiwani Denim & Apparels Ltd.**[2], **Girish Kumar Suneja v. CBI**[3], **Amar Nath v. State of Haryana**[4], the Hon'ble Apex Court held that receiving of documents, summoning of the witnesses are all interlocutory in nature and against which no revision case is maintainable.

5. In view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Sethuraman**, **Bhaskar Industries Ltd.**, **Girish Kumar Suneja**, **Amar Nath** *supra* the Criminal Revision case is not maintainable.

---

[1](2009) 5 SCC 153
[2](2001) 7 SCC 401
[3](2017) 14 SCC 809
[4](1977) 4 SCC 137

6. Hence, the Criminal Revision Case is dismissed granting liberty to the Petitioner to challenge the impugned order in an appropriate proceedings, in accordance with law. There shall be no order as to costs

As a sequel, interlocutory applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

_____

Dr. Y. LAKSHMANA RAO, J

Dt: 06.11.2026
KRS

65

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 231/2026

(ORDER)

Date: 06.11.2026

KRS