APHC010576572026

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

THURSDAY, THE 5th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 1258/2026

Between:

1. CHAPA RAVEENA, W/O SAI PRASAD DHANTAL,AGE 26, OCC PRIVATE EMPLOYEE,R/O D NO 55-19-9,SRI LAKSHMI NILAYAM, 4TH FLOOR,LIG 48,H B COLONY,VISAKHAPATNAM- 530022

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
2. DHANTAL MAHENDRA, S/O. D. GANAPATHI RAJARAM,AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS, RESIDENT OF 6-56/A,ROAD NO.3, GANGASTHAN PHASE-3,GOPANPALLY, NIZAMABAD-503003.
3. DHANTAL SARALA, W/O. DHANTAL MAHENDRA,AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS, RESIDENT OF 6-56/A,ROAD NO.3, GANGASTHAN PHASE-3,GOPANPALLY, NIZAMABAD-503003.
4. MEKALA LALITHA, W/O. MEKALA NAVEEN KUMAR,AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS, RESIDENT OF FLAT NO.301,SRINIDHI ISLANDS, PLOT NOS.6 AND 7,BLOCK NO.178, PRAGATHI NAGAR,BACHPALLE, MEDCHAL-MALKAJGIRI DISTRICT-500090.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. M V S ANIL KUMAR R

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 order dated 02.09.2026 in Crl.R.P.No.20of 2026in Crl.M.P.No.3743 of 2025 in C.C.No.1328 of 2025 passed by the learned II Additional District and Sessions Judge, Visakhapatnam, Nellore whereby and whereunder an application filed under Section 438 of 'the BNSS.,' by the prosecution to set aside the order in Crl.M.P.No.3743 of 2025 was partly allowed. Aggrieved by that order, the Petitioner has preferred the Revision Case.

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

3. Indeed, a revision against interlocutory order is not maintainable as per Section 397(2) of 'the Cr.P.C.' The order impugned is undoubtedly an interim order, as it merely allowed the revision petition in part relaxing some conditions, modifying some conditions and setting aside the some conditions. Those are all interlocutory in nature.

4. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Sethuraman v. Rajamanickam**[1], **Bhaskar Industries Ltd. v. Bhiwani Denim & Apparels Ltd.**[2], **Girish Kumar Suneja**

[1](2009) 5 SCC 153
[2](2001) 7 SCC 401

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.

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 Revision Case is dismissed. However, liberty to grant to the petitioner to challenge the impugned order in 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: 05.11.2026
VMM

[3](2017) 14 SCC 809
[4](1977) 4 SCC 137

194

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 1258/2026

Date:05.11.2026

VMM