APHC010586262026

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

TUESDAY, THE 17th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 9874/2026

Between:

1. M REVANTH KUMAR ALIAS RAJU, S/O LATE M. SUMATHI,AGE ABOUT 31 YEARS R/O VELKURU, CHITTOOR DISTRICT,ANDHRA PRADESH.

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI.

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused:

1. SARMA C V S S

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant:

1. 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.2 for grant of pre-arrest bail in connection with Crime No.143 of 2026 of Tirupathi West Urban Police Station, Tirupathi District, registered for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 329(1), 126(2), 127(2), 115(2), 309(2), 351(2), 109(1) read with 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNS').

2. Mr.Sarma C.V.S.S., learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner is innocent of the alleged offence and has been falsely implicated in the case. He submits that the petitioner is a law-abiding citizen, has a fixed abode and undertakes to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court while granting pre-arrest bail. There is no incriminating material found against the petitioner. The petitioner will not abscond and fully co-operate with the investigation agency.

3. *Per contra,* Mr.A.Sai Rohith, the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor, vehemently opposed the grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner, submitting that the investigation is at progressive stage and several material witnesses are yet to be examined. It is contended that if the petitioner is released on pre-arrest bail, there is a strong likelihood that he may abscond, thereby hampering the ongoing investigation and evading the process of law. Hence, it is urged to dismiss the Criminal Petition.

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

5. On perusal of the record, it appears that Accused Nos.1 to 4, having entertained a common intention, trespassed into the premises of the *de facto* complainant, attacked him and caused injuries. Accused Nos.1, 3 and 4 were already arrested and enlarged on bail. This is a pre-arrest bail application filed by Accused No.2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the wife of the petitioner is eight months pregnant. However, he has not

filed any certificate to that effect. The accusations levelled against the petitioner are specific in nature.

6. In these circumstances, grant of pre-arrest bail is neithera licence nor permission or premium or passport to commit crime, as per the judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab***[1]and ***Sushila Aggarwal v. State of (NCT of Delhi)***[2].

7. Having regard to the specific overt acts attributed to the petitioner, this Court is of the considered view that the discretionary relief of pre-arrest bail cannot be granted. Hence, this Court is not inclined to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction in favour of the petitioner. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the Criminal Petition, and the same is liable to be dismissed.

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

DR. Y. LAKSHMANA RAO, J

Date: 17.11.2026
BMS

[1](1980) 2 SCC 565
[2] (2020) 5 SCC 1