



HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
TUESDAY ,THE TWENTY SIXTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND NINETEEN

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE C.PRAVEEN KUMAR
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE M.SATYANARAYANA MURTHY
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO: 939 OF 2012

Between:

1. MORIGONDI SAMPURNA W/o Venkateswarlu,
R/o Narasayapalem Village,
Yerragondapalem Mandal,
Now at 4th Line, Ekalavya Colony,
Markapur, Prakasam Dist.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF A.P. Represented by its Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

...RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioner(s): Y BALAJI

Counsel for the Respondents: PUBLIC PROSECUTOR (AP)

The Court made the following: ORDER



2019:APHC:15836

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

**TUESDAY, THE TWENTY SIXTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND NINETEEN**

PRESENT

**THE HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE SRI C.PRAVEEN KUMAR
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.SATYANARAYANA MURTHY**



CRIMINAL APPEAL NO: 939 OF 2012

Criminal Appeal under Section 374(2) of Cr.P.C. against the Order/Judgment made in S.C.No.25 of 2012, dated 13.07.2012 on the file of the Court of the VI Additional District and Sessions Judge, Markapur.

Between:

Morigondi Sampurna, W/o. Venkateswarlu,

...Appellant/Accused No.1

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Represented by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

...Respondents/Complainant

Counsel for the Appellant: SRI. Y. BALAJI

Counsel for the Respondent: THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following Judgment:



THE HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE C.PRAVEEN KUMAR

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.SATYANARAYANA MURTHY

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.939 OF 2012

JUDGMENT: *(Per the Hon'ble The Acting Chief Justice C.Praveen Kumar)*

Assailing the conviction and sentence imposed in Sessions Case No.25 of 2011 on the file of the VI Additional District and Sessions Judge (Fast Track Court), Markapur, Prakasam District, dated 13.07.2012, wherein accused No.1 was convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code (for short "I.P.C.") and sentenced her to undergo imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of Rs.1,000/- in default, to suffer simple imprisonment for two months, and to undergo rigorous imprisonment for three years and to pay a fine of Rs.500/-, in default, to suffer simple imprisonment for one month, respectively, the present appeal came to be filed under Section 374(2) of Cr.P.C. by the appellant-accused No.1.

Originally two accused were tried on two charges - the first charge was under Section 302 r/w. Sec.34 of IPC and the second charge was under Section 201 r/w. Sec.34 of I.P.C. While acquitting accused No.2 of both the charges, convicted accused No.1 as referred to above.

The substance of both the charges against accused Nos.1 and 2 is that on 07.09.2011 at 12.30 hours in Ekalavya Colony, Markapur, in the house of sister of accused No.1, both the accused caused the deceased boy Yanmani Venkata Siva Prasad, aged about 9 years, by throttling his neck and later poured kerosene over the body of the



deceased and set him fire with a match stick, to screen away the evidence.

The facts as culled out from the evidence of prosecution witnesses are as under:-

P.W.1 is the father, P.W.2 is the mother, P.W.3 is the grand mother (mother of P.W.2) and P.W.4 is the neighbour of the deceased, who were examined to speak about the circumstances, relied upon by the prosecution. P.W.1, who is the father of the deceased, in his evidence deposed that he is eking out his livelihood by doing coolie work. According to him, he used to go to coolie work at 6.00 A.M. in the morning and return home at 9.00 P.M. On the date of incident, at about 2.30 P.M. while he was attending his work, one Ramesh (not examined) telephoned to the water vehicle driver informing about the death of the deceased as he was set fire after pouring kerosene. Immediately, P.W.1 rushed to his house, situated in Ekalavya Colony, Markapur, and noticed his son's dead body burnt to ashes, in the middle room of his house. He also observed gathering of all his neighbours at his house. On the same day at about 4.00 P.M. he lodged a report before P.W.19 - Sub-Inspector of Police, Markapur Town Police Station, basing on which, P.W.19 registered a case against P.W.2 and accused No.1 in Crime No.152 of 2011 for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 201 r/w.34 of I.P.C. and issued Ex.P-18 F.I.R. Further investigation in this case was taken up by P.W.20 - the Inspector of Police, Markapur Circle. He proceeded to the scene of offence and in the presence of P.W.15 - Makam Kotaiah, V.R.O, he prepared Ex.P-11 the scene of offence observation report. He noticed the dead body lying in supine position. He also noticed a green colour kerosene can, a match-box and half burnt mat, on which the dead body was lying. He also got photographed the scene of



offence and prepared Ex.P-19 the rough sketch of the scene of offence. As it was late in the evening, he returned to his office by posting a guard at the scene of offence. On the next day morning, he again visited the scene of offence and conducted inquest over the dead body of the deceased in the presence of mediators and blood relatives of the deceased. During inquest, he examined P.W.1, P.W.3, P.W.4 and others. All the witnesses unanimously opined that the deceased might have been killed by P.W.2, mother of the deceased or accused No.1 or their paramour. After completing the inquest, he sent the dead body of the deceased to the Government Area Hospital, Markapur for autopsy. P.W.17-Dr. S.Ravindra Reddy, C.A.S, Government Area Hospital, Markapur, conducted autopsy over the dead body of the deceased and issued Exs.P-16 and P-17 preliminary and final post-examination reports.

On 09.09.2011 at about 3.30 P.M., P.W.15 – Makam Kotaiah, along with accused No.1 came to the office of P.W.20 – Inspector of Police, and disclosed that accused No.1 approached him at 12.00 Noon and made a confession admitting her guilt. After recording her confession, P.W.15 brought accused No.1 along with Ex.P-13 the extra-judicial confession statement of accused No.1 recorded by him to the Police Station. In the presence of mediators, P.W.20 interrogated the accused No.1 and cross-checked the contents of Ex.P-13, wherein she reiterated the confession made by her before P.W.15. P.W.20 seized a black colour cell phone-M.O.1 from accused No.1. He also recorded the statement of P.W.15, who produced accused No.1 before him at 3.30 P.M. on 09.09.2011. On the same day at about 4.30 P.M. he received credible information about the movements of accused No.2. After securing the mediators, he proceeded to Rayavaram in their jeep, where a person was running



away on seeing them. On suspicion, the said person was apprehended, who disclosed his name and identity as accused No.2. On interrogation, he is alleged to have confessed about the commission of offence. Basing on the confession of accused Nos.1 and 2, the name of P.W.2 was deleted from the array of accused. Further investigation was done by P.W.21 K.V.Raghavendra, Inspector of Police, Markapur Circle. After verifying the investigation done by P.W.20 and after receipt of RFSL report etc, which were placed on record as Exs.P-20 to P-23, P.W.21 laid charge-sheet against accused Nos.1 and 2 before the Court of the Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Markapur, which was taken on file as P.R.C.No.48 of 2011, who after complying with Section 207 Cr.P.C., committed the case to the Sessions Division under Section 209 of Cr.P.C, as the offence under Section 302 of IPC is exclusively triable by Court of Session. On committal, the same came to be numbered as Sessions Case No.25 of 2011.

Basing on the material available on record, charges under Sections 302 r/w.34 of I.P.C and Section 201 r/w.34 of I.P.C. against accused Nos.1 and 2 were framed, read over and explained to them, to which they pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.

To substantiate its case, the prosecution examined P.Ws.1 to 21 and got marked Exs.P-1 to P-23 and M.Os.1 to 5.

After the closure of prosecution evidence, the accused Nos.1 and 2 were examined under Section 313 Cr.P.C., with reference to the incriminating circumstances appearing against them, in the evidence of the prosecution witnesses, to which they denied. But, however, they did not adduce any oral or documentary evidence in support of their plea.



Out of 21 witnesses examined by the prosecution, P.Ws.2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 12 did not support the prosecution case and were declared hostile. Relying upon the evidence of P.Ws.1, 5, 7, 11 and 15, the learned VI Additional District and Sessions Judge, Markapur, while acquitting accused No.2 for the offences of which he was charged, convicted the accused No.1 for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 of I.P.C. and sentenced her as aforementioned. Challenging the same, the present appeal came to be filed by the appellant - accused No.1.

The main ground urged by Sri Y.Balaji, learned counsel for the appellant-accused No.1, is that there are no eye-witnesses to the incident and the circumstances relied upon by the prosecution do not form chain of events connecting the accused No.1 with the crime. According to him, all the material witnesses, including P.W.2, the mother of the deceased, did not support the prosecution case and were declared hostile. He further pleaded that there is absolutely no legal evidence on record to show that accused Nos.1 and 2 were present in the house of P.Ws.1 and 2 at the time of the incident. In so far as extra-judicial confession is concerned, the evidence of P.W.15 cannot be considered, since he acted as panch witness in all the proceedings in this case, namely the scene of offence observation report, inquest report, arrest of accused and seizure of M.O.1.

On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-State while supporting the judgment of the trial Court would contend that the evidence brought on record, more particularly, the evidence of P.W.5 and P.W.7 is sufficient to convict the accused No.1. He took us through the evidence of P.W.5 and P.W.7 and pleaded that there is no reason or justification to disbelieve their evidence, more so, the evidence of P.W.5, who is a child witness.



The point that arises for consideration in this appeal is, whether the circumstances relied upon by the prosecution are proved and if proved whether they are sufficient to base the conviction of the accused No.1?

Admittedly there are no eye-witnesses to the incident and the case rests on the circumstantial evidence. It is to be seen whether the circumstantial evidences relied upon by the prosecution are sufficient to connect the accused No.1 with the crime.

The first circumstance relied upon by the prosecution is the alleged motive for commission of offence, namely, that accused Nos. 1 and 2 were seen while they were in compromising position by some of the witnesses, who in-turn informed about the same to P.Ws.1 and 2.

In order to prove the same, the prosecution mainly relied upon the evidence of P.W.11, who, in his evidence categorically stated that, having noticed frequent visits of accused No.2 to the house of P.Ws. 1 and 2 for the sake of accused No.1 and illicit intimacy between them, he is said to have admonished accused No.1 about ten days prior to the incident and also complained about the same to P.W.2. According to P.W.11, he requested P.W.2 to send accused No.1 from the house as it is a residential area and such things are not permissible. The sister of accused No.1 (P.W.2) promised him to send accused No.1 from her house shortly. However, though P.W.11, in his evidence-in-chief, spoke about accused Nos. 1 and 2 indulging in sexual activity/maintaining illicit relationship, but, in the cross-examination, he admits that had not seen accused Nos. 1 and 2 participating in the sex and nobody complained to him about accused Nos. 1 and 2.

Further, P.W.1 in his cross-examination admits that he never informed before the police or in Ex.P-1 about seeing accused Nos.1



and 2 in his house together ten days prior to the occurrence and about the assurance given by his wife to take care of accused No.1. On the other hand, he admits that accused No.1 used to stay with her husband and in-laws at Narasayapalem and that accused No.1 and her husband did not obtain any divorce. He further admits that, till date, he is not aware as to the exact reason for the death of the deceased. Therefore, the motive which is sought to be established by the prosecution i.e. accused Nos. 1 and 2 having illicit relationship and the incident in question took place due to P.W.1 admonishing them is not established by any cogent material. More so, as P.W.2 to whom P.W.1 informed about the said illicit relationship did not support the prosecution case and she was treated hostile by the prosecution.

The next circumstance, which is sought to be relied upon by the prosecution, is the theory of accused being last seen with the deceased before the commission of offence. P.W.1 who is the father of the deceased, in his evidence deposed, that since five months prior to the date of incident, accused No.1 was staying with them along with her daughter after undergoing operation. It is his evidence that by the time he rushed home, on receipt of information about death of the deceased, his wife-P.W.2 and accused No.1 were present in the house, as P.W.2 did not go to coolie work on that day. The reason given by P.W.1 for his wife not attending the coolie work was to present a saree to accused No.1 while sending her to her in-laws house. The evidence-in-chief of P.W.1 does not categorically establish the presence of accused No.2 in his house, but it only speaks about his wife-P.W.2 and accused No.1 being present in the house. That is why, in the first information report and also in the inquest report, a suspicion was entertained against P.W.2 and accused No.1. Having excluded P.W.2



from the array of accused, one cannot conclusively say that it was accused No.1 who was responsible for the incident. Things would have been different had there been no other person except accused No.1 in the house. However, in the cross-examination, P.W.1 admits that he never stated before the police during the course of investigation or in the Ex.P-1 about the presence of accused No.1 in the house, since five months prior to the occurrence of incident. He further admits that he never stated before the police or in Ex.P-1 about someone informing him about pouring of kerosene on his son and setting him on fire. He further admits that, he did not state before the police about his wife – P.W.2 not attending the coolie work on that day as she planned to present a saree to accused No.1. He further admits that he did not state before the police, that he is suspecting the character of his wife. However, according to him, accused No.1 was staying in Narasayapalem with her in-laws.

P.W.2, who is the wife of P.W.1 and who was said to be present in the house at the time of incident, did not support the prosecution case and was declared hostile. Her evidence is totally different from what P.W.1 stated in his evidence. According to her, she was never in the house on that day and that she has gone to Markapur to purchase saree.

P.W.3, who is mother-in-law of P.W.1 and mother of P.W.2, also did not support the case of prosecution and was declared hostile. P.W.4 in his evidence speaks about flames emanating from the house of the deceased and on hearing the shouts of the women folk of the colony, he came out and proceeded towards the house of P.W.1. He is said to have informed the relatives about the incident. He was also declared hostile and cross-examined by the prosecution.



P.W.5 is a child witness and a close associate of the deceased. He was aged about 9 years as on the date of giving evidence. After being satisfied with regard to mental fitness and capacity to understand the Court proceedings, the Court proceeded to record his evidence. He, in his evidence, deposed that he knew accused No.1 and the deceased and had played for sometime with the deceased on the day of incident. He had seen the deceased and his sister entering into their house and purchasing ice creams at about 1-30 p.m. At about 2:30 p.m on hearing galata near the house of deceased, rushed towards the said place and found the deceased being killed by somebody by setting him on fire. He neither noticed the parents of the deceased nor spoke about the presence of accused Nos.1 and 2 at the scene of offence. He was also declared hostile by the prosecution.

In so far as P.W.7 is concerned, she, in her evidence deposed that she has seen accused No.2 entering the house of deceased on the date of incident. At about 1:00 p.m she found smoke emanating from the house of the deceased. According to her, on seeing the flames, she came out of the house and found accused Nos.1 and 2 coming out from the house and proceeding in different directions. As her baby cried, she went inside the house and thereafter, through neighbours came to know that the deceased was being killed by accused Nos.1 and 2.

In the cross-examination, she admits that she did not state before the police about noticing accused No.2 coming out of the house of the deceased along with accused No.1 and proceeding in different directions. She also did not state before the police about the acquaintance of accused No.1 with accused No.2. She further admits that she did not state before the police about noticing accused No.2 entering or coming out of the house. From the evidence of this



witness, it is very clear that in the earlier statements, she never spoke about seeing of accused Nos.1 and 2 coming out of the house of the deceased and proceeding in different directions. Therefore, the evidence of this witness does not conclusively establish the presence of accused Nos.1 and 2 in the house at the time of incident.

The evidence of other witnesses relied upon by the prosecution are P.Ws.11 and 13. P.W.11 is a resident of Bommilingam village and he knew the deceased, P.Ws.1, 2, accused Nos. 1 and 2. In his evidence, he deposed about the frequent visits of accused No.2 to the house of P.Ws.1 and 2 for the sake of accused No.1 and about P.W.1 informing him about illicit intimacy between accused Nos.1 and 2. He further requested P.W.2 to send away accused No.1 from her house saying that it was a residential area and such things are not permissible. According to him, accused No.1 joined P.Ws.1 and 2 and stayed there for a continuous period of five months prior to the occurrence of the incident. On hearing about the death of the deceased, he came and noticed the dead body. He further states that, he did not observe the presence of the persons and that he does not know who killed the deceased as he was not in their colony during morning hours on that day. From the evidence-in-chief of this witness, it is clear that it is silent as to the presence of accused Nos.1 and 2 in the house of the deceased or seen them near the place of incident. He did not speak about witnessing accused Nos.1 and 2 entering the house of the deceased. Therefore, his evidence, which was relied upon by the prosecution to prove the illicit intimacy between accused Nos.1 and 2, cannot be accepted as observed by us earlier.

P.W.13 is the only other witness who was examined to speak the theory of accused being last seen in the company of the deceased.



He, in his evidence deposed that on 07.09.2011 at about 8:00 a.m he along with accused No.2 went to the factory for attending packing work. At about 10:45 a.m, when he and his colleagues came out to have tea near the tea stall, accused No.2 received a telephone call. On receipt of the phone call, accused No.2 left towards Ekalavya Colony by saying that he will come and join later, but did not disclose anything. The evidence of this witness, in our view, does not establish any connection of accused No.1 with the incident proper. As per the evidence of this witness, he along with accused No.2 went to their factory at 8:00 a.m where accused No.2 received a phone call at 10:45 a.m while having a tea. On receipt of the phone call, accused No.2 left towards Ekalavya Colony saying that he would come and join later. The evidence of this witness does not indicate as to the person from whom accused No.2 received the phone call and also as to the place where he went in Ekalavya Colony. Therefore, this evidence of P.W.13 does not establish the theory of accused and deceased being last seen together alive soon before death. In fact, his evidence does not refer to the place where the deceased was at the time of the incident.

From the evidence of the witnesses referred to above, it can safely be concluded that they are wholly unreliable and based on such testimony, it may not be proper for us to hold accused No.1 guilty, more so, when the other circumstance, namely, motive is not established.

The only other circumstance left is the extra judicial confession made by accused No.1 before P.W.15. P.W.15 is no other than the Village Revenue Officer of Markapur, who was working there since last four years. According to him, on 09.09.2011 at about 11:00 a.m, accused No.1 is said to have approached him and made a confession admitting her guilt, which came to be recorded under Ex.P-13 and



thereafter, along with the accused No.1, a report was handed over to the police. It is to be noted that, though P.W.15 in his evidence speaks about the extra judicial confession made by accused No.1, but however, his admissions in the cross-examination establish that he was a total stranger. It would be appropriate to extract the relevant admissions in his cross-examination, in his own words, which are as under:

“.... I do not have prior acquaintance with A-1. In my service I did not help to A-1 and her family members personally any time. For the first time I came to know the identity of A-1 and about her relationship with deceased boy's family on 09.09.2011. I did not prepare any rough note. I directly recorded the confession of A.1. In four or five cases belonging to Markapur Town P.S. I recorded extra judicial confession.....”

From the admissions made by P.W.15, two things pop up, namely, accused No.1 was a stranger to P.W.15 and secondly he was a stock witness of Markapur Town Police Station. Apart from that, even in the present case, he acted as a mediator to the observation of scene of offence, inquest report, panch for seizure of M.Os.1 to 5 and also for arrest of the accused. Therefore, it is improbable to believe that accused No.1, who is a stranger and who has no prior acquaintance with P.W.15, would have gone to him and made an extra judicial confession admitting her guilt.

While dealing with the evidentiary value and reliability of extra judicial confession, the Apex Court, in **Vijay Shankar v. State of Haryana**¹, held as follows:

"18. Principles in respect of evidentiary value and reliability of extra-judicial confession have been summarized by this Court in **Sahadevan v. State of T.N**² which reads as under:

¹(2015) 12 scc 644



"(i) The extra-judicial confession is a weak evidence by itself. It has to be examined by the court with greater care and caution.

(ii) It should be made voluntarily and should be truthful.

(iii) It should inspire confidence.

(iv) An extra-judicial confession attains greater credibility and evidentiary value if it is supported by a chain of cogent circumstances and is further corroborated by other prosecution evidence.

(v) For an extra-judicial confession to be the basis of conviction, it should not suffer from any material discrepancies and inherent improbabilities.

(vi) Such statement essentially has to be proved like any other fact and in accordance with law."

The Apex Court, in **Kala v. State through Inspector of Police**³, while discussing the law with regard to extra-judicial confession, observed as follows:

"In **Sahadevan and Anr. v. State of Tamil Nadu** (referred supra), it has been observed that extra-judicial confession is weak piece of evidence. Before acting upon it the Court must ensure that the same inspires confidence and it is corroborated by other prosecution evidence. In **Balwinder Singh v. State of Punjab**⁴, it has been observed that extra-judicial confession requires great deal of care and caution before acceptance. There should be no suspicious circumstances surrounding it. In **Pakkirisamy v. State of Tamil Nadu**⁵ it has been observed that there has to be independent corroboration for placing any reliance upon extra-judicial confession. In **Kavita v. State of Tamil Nadu**⁶ it has been observed that reliability of the same depends upon the veracity of the witnesses to whom it is made. Similar view has been expressed in **State of Rajasthan v. Raja Ram**⁷, in which this Court has further observed that witness must be unbiased and not even remotely inimical to the accused. In **Alokenath Dutta v. State of West Bengal**⁸ it has been observed that the main features of confession are required to be verified. In **Sansar Chand v. State of Rajasthan**⁹

² (2012) 6 SCC 403

³ AIR 2016 SC 3912

⁴ 1995 Supp (4) SCC 259

⁵ (1997) 8 SCC 158

⁶ 1998) 6 SCC 108

⁷ (2003) 8 SCC 180

⁸ (2007) 12 SCC 230

⁹ (2010) 10 SCC 604



it has been observed that extra-judicial confession should be corroborated by some other material on record. In **Rameshbhai Chandubhai Rathod v. State of Gujarat**¹⁰ it has been observed that in the case of retracted confession it is unsafe for the Court to rely on it. In **Vijay Shankar v. State of Haryana**¹¹ this Court has followed the decision in **Sahadevan**'s case (supra)."

From the judgment in **Kala v. State through Inspector of Police**, (supra), it is clear that extra judicial confession is a weak type of evidence and it has to be examined by the Courts with greater care and caution. However, if the extra-judicial confession is the basis for conviction, it should not suffer from any material discrepancies and inherent improbabilities. Further, extra judicial confession statement alone cannot be made the basis to confirm the conviction, when it is doubtful or when it is surrounded by suspicious circumstances.

Therefore, in view of the guidelines laid down by the Apex Court in the judgments referred supra, the extra judicial confession made before P.W.15 – the Village Revenue Officer can be accepted, if it is found reliable. But, in the instant case, we find that, it may not be safe to act on the alleged extra judicial confession made by accused No.1 before P.W.15 for the reasons aforementioned. In fact, it is to be noted that, at a particular stage, P.W.15 was also declared hostile by the prosecution and he was cross-examined. Viewed from any angle, we do not find any reason to accept the evidence of P.W.15 as an independent witness.

Having regard to the above discussion, we hold that the prosecution failed to establish the guilt of the appellant – accused No.1 for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 of I.P.C., for which she was convicted, and as such the judgment of the

¹⁰ (2009) 5 SCC 740

¹¹ (2015) 12 SCC 644

lower Court cannot be sustained and the same is liable to be set aside.

In the result, the Criminal Appeal is allowed and the conviction and sentence imposed against the appellant-accused No.1 - Morigondi Sampurna W/o.Venkateswarlu, for the offences punishable under Sections 302 and 201 of I.P.C., in Sessions Case No.25 of 2012 on the file of the VI Additional District and Sessions Judge (Fast Track Court), Markapur, Prakasam District, by judgment dated 13.07.2012, are set aside. The appellant-accused No.1 is acquitted and she shall be set at liberty forthwith, if she is not required in any other case.

Consequently, miscellaneous applications pending if any, shall also stand closed.

**SD/- P. RAMAKRISHNA
 JOINT REGISTRAR**

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

**One Fair Copy to the Hon'ble The Acting Chief Justice Sri C.Praveen Kumar)
 (For his Lordships Kind Perusal)**

**One Fair Copy to the Hon'ble Sri Justice M. Satyanarayana Murthy)
 (For his Lordships Kind Perusal)**

To,

1. The VI Additional District and Sessions Judge, (Fast Track Court), Markapur.
2. The Additional Judicial First Class Magistrate, Markapur, Prakasam District.
3. The Station House Officer, Markapur Town Police Station, Markapur, Prakasam District.
4. The Superintendent, Central Jail, Cuddapah.
5. The Director General of Police, Vijayawada, Krishna District.
6. Two CCs to the Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh (OUT)
7. 9 L.R. Copies.
8. The Under Secretary Union of India, Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, New Delhi.
9. The Secretary, Advocates Association (AP) Library, High Court Buildings, Amaravathi.
10. One CC to Sri Y. Balaji, Advocate (OPUC)
11. Two C.D. Copies.

Chp

Phen



2019:APHC:15836



HIGH COURT

2019:APHC:15836

DATED:26/02/2019

OC
2/5/19

JUDGMENT

CRLA.No.939 of 2012

RS. 2400
96

Received
24/4/19

ALLOWING THE CRIMINAL APPEAL

23 Copies
Phair
18/4

LP