APHC010583572026

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH**
**AT AMARAVATI** **[3504]**
**(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

TUESDAY, THE 3rd DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM**

**CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 9820/2026**

**Between:**

1. PALIVELA NARESH KUMAR, S/O. RAMAKRISHNA,AGED 35 YEARS, OCC ASSISTANT MANAGERIN DANIEL INDIS LTD, R/O , D NO 3-12-53,SUNKATAREVU VILLAGE, THALLAREVU MANDAL ,KAKINADA DISTRICT, A.P.

2. PALLIVELA RAMAKRISHNA, S/O. NARAYAN,AGED 58 YEARS, HINDU OCC RTC DRIVER,R/O D NO 3-12-53, SUNKATAREVU VILLAGETHALLAREVU MANDAL, KAKINADA DISTRICT, A.P.

3. PALLIVELLA DEVI LAKSHMI, W/O RAMAKRISHNA,AGED 50 YEARS , BUSINESS, SETTIBALIJA COMMUNITYR/O D NO 3-12-53, THALLAREVU MANDAL KAKINADA DISTRICT AP.

4. MEDISETTI SATYA SAI VENKATA DHANALAKSHMI, W/O. SRINIVAS, AGED 31 YEARS, HOUSEWIFE,R/O SANTHI NAGARAM, NEAR PEDDAKALUVA VANTENA, RAMACHANDRAPURAM ,RAMACHANDRAPURAM MANDAL, DR.B.R.A.KONASEEMA DISTRICT AP PIN CODE 533255 RCPM P S LIMITS, RCPM JCJC

5. MEDISETTI SRINIVAS, S/O. NOT KNOWN, AGED 38 YEARS, PRO IN HOSPITAL- KAKINADA, R/O SANTHI NAGARAM, NEAR PEDDA KALUVAVANTENA, RAMACHANDRAPURAM, RAMACHANDRAPURAM MANDAL, DR.B.R.A. KONASEEMA DISTRICT, AP PIN CODE 533255 RCPM P S LIMITS, RCPM JCJC

6. KADALI SRINIVASU, S/O. SOMARAJU,AGED 46 YEARS, OCC MECHANIC,R/O SANTHI NAGARAM, NEAR PEDDAKALUVA VANTENA, RAMACHANDRAPURAM,RAMACHANDRAPURAM MANDAL, DR.B.R.A.KONASEEMA DISTRICT,AP PIN CODE

533255RCPM P S LIMITS, RCPM JCJC

7. KADALI SRILAKSHMI, W/O SRINIVASU AGED 40 YEARS,HOUSEWIFE, R/O SANTHI NAGARAM, NEAR PEDDAKALUVA VANTENA, RAMACHANDRAPURAM,RAMACHANDRAPURAM MANDAL, DR.B.R.A.KONASEEMA DISTRICT, AP PIN CODE 533255RCPM P S LIMITS, RCPM JCJC

**...PETITIONER/ACCUSED(S)**

**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT BUILDINGS,AMARAVATI

2. PALLIVELA SUDHA, W/O NARESH KUMAR AGED 29 YEARS, HINDU ,OCC HOUSEWIFE ,R/O DNO 34-16-48/5A, NEAR BANDHAN BANK,VIJYA LAKSHMI NAGAR, MANDAPETA TOWN, MANDAPETA MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT - 533308

3. PALLIVELLA DANVAT SRIRAM, S/O. NARESH KUMAR,AGED 06 YEARS, HINDU OCC HOUSEWIFE,R/O D.NO 34-16-48/5A, NEAR BANDHAN BANK,VIJYALAKSHMI NAGAR, MANDAPETA TOWN, MANDAPETA MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT, 533308

**...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT(S):**

Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C and 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court pleased to quash the proceedings in D.V.C. No.7 of 2026, pending on the file of the Learned Judicial First Class Magistrate, Alamuru insofar as the Petitioners herein are concerned,

**IA NO: 1 OF 2026**

Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C and 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to dispense with filing of Certified Copy of the DVC No.7 of 2026 on the file of the Court Judicial First Class Magistrate, Alamuru and pass

**IA NO: 2 OF 2026**

Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C and 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings, including the personal appearance of the Petitioners, in D.V.C. No. 7 of 2026 on the file of the Learned Judicial First Class Magistrate, Alamuru, insofar as the Petitioners herein are concerned, and pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner/accused(S):**

1. K.V.S.S.PRABHAKARA RAO
2. K V S S PRABHAKARA RAO

**Counsel for the Respondent/complainant(S):**

1. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM**

**CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 9820 of 2026**

**ORDER:-**

Instant Criminal Petition, under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, has been filed on behalf of the petitioners herein, seeking to quash the proceedings in DVC No.7 of 2026 on the file of learned Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Alamuru, claiming reliefs under Section 12, 18, 19, 20 & 23 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, after arguing for some time, has confined his argument to the extent of dispensing with the presence of the petitioners before the trial Court by submitting petitioners' practical constraints in attending before the trial Court and states that petitioners shall not dispute his identity at a later stage of proceedings.

4. On the other hand, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor contended that specific accusations have been made as against the petitioners herein and truth or otherwise of the said accusations has to be decided during the course of trial, hence, there are no grounds to quash the proceedings at this stage. So far as dispensing with the presence of the petitioners, before the trial Court, he has not opposed the same.

5. Since there are specific accusations that have been made as against the petitioners herein, which are all disputed questions of fact, the same can be decided during the course of trial, and this Court, in a petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 corresponding to Section 482 Cr.P.C., would not be in a position to conduct roving enquiry into the disputed questions of fact and quash the proceedings at this stage.

6. In this context, it is apt to note the dictum held in ***State of Uttar Pradesh and Another Vs. Akhil Sharda and Others***[1], by the Apex Court in its vivid terms in the following way:

> *7. Having gone through the impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court by which the High Court has set aside the criminal proceedings in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., it appears that the High Court has virtually conducted a mini trial, which as such is not permissible at this stage and while deciding the application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. As observed and held by this Court in a catena of decisions no mini trial can be conducted by the High Court in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., jurisdiction and at the stage of deciding the application under Section 482 Cr.P.C., the High Court cannot get into appreciation of evidence of the particular case being considered.*

7. In ***Vishal Shah Vs. Monalisha Gupta & Ors.***[2], Hon'ble Apex Court has observed that there is no requirement for the personal appearance of any party in the proceedings under the Domestic Violence Act, 2005, because

[1] 2022 LiveLaw (SC) 594
[2] 2025 Live Law (SC) 240

they are *quasi*-criminal in nature and do not entail any penal consequences, except when there is a breach of a protection order, which is the only offence provided under Section 31 of the Domestic Violence Act, 2005.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to quash the proceedings against the petitioners herein. However, due to ground realities submitted by the counsel for the petitioners, presence of the petitioners herein (Respondent Nos.1 to 7) before the Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Alamuru, in DVC No.7 of 2026 is hereby dispensed with, except on those dates when the learned trial Court feels that their presence is necessary. In the event of failure of the petitioners to appear when the trial Court specifically directs, this Order shall stands automatically revoked, without recourse to this Court.

9. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is disposed of.

10. Needless to state that the petitioners are at liberty to raise all the grounds before the trial Court.

As a sequel, all pending applications shall stand closed.

**JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM**

Date: 03.11.2026
RMR

**81**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM**

**CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 9820 of 2026**

**03.11.2026**

W

RMR