APHC010559292026

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

MONDAY, THE 16th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 1220/2026

Between:

1. KHANDAVALLI JHANSI LAKSHMI DEVI, ,W/O. UNDRAJAVARAAPU KRISHNA,FEMALE, AGED 45 YEARS, BANK EMPLOYEE,SPECIAL ASSISTANT, STATE BANK OF INDIA,MAIN BRANCH, YERRAMILLI VANI VEEDHI,TANUKU, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT - 534211

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, , REP BY ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI-522 239.
2. TAMMISETTI VEERA VENKATA SUBBA RAO, ,S/O. SRI SATYANARAYANA, MALE, AGED 46 YEARS,R/O D.NO.4-65, VINAYAKA TEMPLE STREET,OPP PANCHAYAT OFFICE, EAST VIPPARU,IRAGAVARAM MANDAL, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT - 534328

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. MALLAVELLI NAGA SAI LALITH KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The Criminal Revision Case has been filed under Sections 438 and 442 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNSS.,') challenging the docket orders dated 31.08.2026, 02.09.2026 & 11.09.2026 in unnumbered Crl.M.P.No.__ of 2026 in Crl.A.No.152 of 2026 passed by the learned IV Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tanuku.

2. Heard the learned Legal Aid Counsel for the Petitioner and the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor. Perused the record.

3. The docket orders impugned dated 31.08.2026, 02.09.2026 & 11.09.2026 in unnumbered Crl.M.P.No.__ of 2026 in Crl.A.No.152 of 2026 passed by the learned IV Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tanuku are interlocutory in nature, against which no revision lies. Indeed, a revision against interlocutory order is not maintainable as per Section 397(2) of 'the Cr.P.C.'

4. 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], held that receiving of documents, summoning of the witnesses are all interlocutory in nature and against which no revision case is maintainable.

---

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

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.

6. Hence, the Criminal Revisional Case is dismissed. The Petitioner shall do the needful as per the written orders. 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: 16.11.2026
VTS