SS,J
Crl.R.C.No. 922 of 2009
Dated 06.10.2026

APHC010424282009

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI [3560]
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE 6th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBHENDU SAMANTA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 922 OF 2009

Between:

1. S. PADMAVATHI, D/O. VENKANNA HOUSEWIFE DEVARAPALLY (V) RAVULAPALLEM (M) E.G. DT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF A P 2 OTHERS, SHO, REP. BY P.P., AT HIGH COURT OF A.P. HYDERABAD. RAVULAPALEM P.S. E.G. DT.
2. SEELAM VENKATARAMANA, S/O. KRISHNA MURTHY LORRY CLEANER RAVULAPALEM E.G. DT.
3. SEELAM MAHALAKSHMI, W/O. VENKANNA RAVULAPALEM E.G. DT.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. K L N SWAMY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBHENDU SAMANTA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 922 OF 2009

ORDER:

1. Instant Criminal Revision Case has been preferred by the Petitioner/Defacto complainant against the Judgment and order of acquittal dated 20.04.2009 passed by the learned Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Kothapeta, in C.C.No.294 of2005.

2. None appears on behalf of the Petitioner.

3. It appears from the proceedings that the petitioner is not turning up for many occasions.

4. This Court, after admitting Criminal Revision Case in the year 2009, directed the petitioner to take out personal notice upon Respondent.

5. On seeing the proof of service, it appears that they are returned with postal endorsement as “Insufficient address” in respect of Respondents No.2 and 3. Petitioner was directed to take fresh steps but, this was not complied with.

6. None appears on behalf of petitioner this day also.

7. Petitioner is the defacto complainant, who is aggrieved against the order of acquittal.

8. Considering the long pendency of the matter, this Court has directed the petitioner to appear finally before this Court to argue the matter. Today also, none appears on behalf of the petitioner.

9. In these circumstances, this Court heard the matter on merit.

10. Brief facts of prosecution case are that: Basing on the report given by the petitioner/ defacto complainant the Sub-Inspector of Police, Ravulapalem police station filed charge sheet against present Respondent in Crime No.190 of 2001 of Ravulapalem Police Station. On appearance of the respondent as an accused, copies of documents were served and charge was framed for the offences under Sections 117, 193 and 120 of the Indian Penal Code.

11. During trial before the learned Trial Court, five witnesses were examined by prosecution as P.W.1 to P.W.5 and three documents were marked, viz., petitioner's report and two other documents as Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.3.

12. Having perused the entire evidences on record and observation of the learned Trial Court in paragraphs No.8 and 9 of the impugned Judgment, I am of the view that the order of acquittal passed by the learned Trial Court is justified. Prosecution could not produced sufficient evidence to record conviction against accused persons beyond reasonable doubt. Thus, impugned order of

acquittal suffers no illegality or impropriety. Hence, I find no merit in the instant Criminal Revision Case.

13. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case is dismissed as devoid of merits.

Consequently, pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

SRI JUSTICE SUBHENDU SAMANTA

Dated 06.10.2026
KS

91

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBHENDU SAMANTA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 922 OF 2009

Dated:06.10.2026.

KS