APHC010575292026

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

WEDNESDAY, THE 4th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 9652/2026

Between:

SEEMAKURTHI JAGADEESH, S/O SATYANARAYANA, AGED 28 YEARS, OCC BUSINESS, R/O D.NO. 9-91,NEAR GOVT. FLOSPITAL BACK SIDE,DEVARAPALLI VILLAGE MANDAL,KOVVURU, RAJAHMUNDRY, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 534313.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED

AND

THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor,High Court of Andhra Pradesh.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused:

SHAIK SHAHEDAZ

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant:

PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The Criminal Petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNSS') by the petitioner/Accused No.3 for granting of pre-arrest bail in connection with Crime No.109 of 2026 of Allavaram Police Station, Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Konaseema District, registered for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 103(1), 238, 127(2) read with 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNS').

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

3. As seen from the record, this Court, *vide* order dated 09.10.2026 in Crl.P.No.8601 of 2026, dismissed the first anticipatory bail application filed by the petitioner. There are no merits in this petition.

4. In this regard, it is apposite to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **G.R. Ananda Babu v. State of Tamil Nadu**[1], wherein, at paragraph No. 6, it was held as under:

> *6.As a matter of fact, successive anticipatory bail applications ought not to be entertained and more so, when the case diary and the status report, clearly indicated that the accused (Respondent 2) is absconding and not cooperating with the investigation. The specious reason of change in circumstances cannot be invoked for successive anticipatory bail applications, once it is rejected by a speaking order and that too by the same Judge.*

[1] (2021) 16 SCC 725

5. Thus, in **G.R.Ananda Babu** *supra*, it was held that successive anticipatory bail applications are not maintainable when the accused is absconding and not cooperating with the investigation. A mere change in circumstances is not a valid ground once an earlier application has been rejected by a reasoned order. The order passed by this Court is also a speaking order answering all the contentions raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner. There are no merits in the petition. Hence, this Criminal Petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. In the result, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

As a sequel, Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall stand closed.

DR. Y. LAKSHMANA RAO, J

Date: 04.11.2026
RSI

79

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION No.9652 of 2026

Date:04.11.2026

RSI