



**HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH**  
THURSDAY ,THE TWENTY FIRST 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: 1214 OF 2012**

**Between:**

1. BUAYA KURUMALA KALVAGADDA RAMESH S/o.Chandrayudu cloth vendor,  
Kota Street, Pedda Bazar, Puttaparthi  
Anantapur Dist.

**...PETITIONER(S)**

**AND:**

1. THE STATE OF A.P., REP.P.P., ANANTAPUR DIST. High Court of A.p.,  
through Inspector of Police  
Puttaparthi Urban P.S. Anantapur Dist.

**...RESPONDENTS**

**Counsel for the Petitioner(s): T PRADYUMNA KUMAR REDDY**

**Counsel for the Respondents: PUBLIC PROSECUTOR**

**The Court made the following: ORDER**



2019:APHC:15835

Bail Slip: The Accused was directed to be released on Bail by the Order of the High Court Order dated: 19/2/2018 in I.A.No. 1/2018 in CrI.A. 1214/2012.

**HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH**

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF FEBRUARY  
TWO THOUSAND AND NINETEEN

**PRESENT**

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

**CRIMINAL APPEAL NO: 1214 OF 2012**

Criminal Appeal under Section 374(2) of Cr.P.C against the Judgment made in S.C. No.292 of 2011 dt.30/10/2012 on the file of the Court of the Additional Sessions Judge, Hindupur.

**Between:**

Buaya Kurumala Kalvagadda Ramesh, S/o.Chandrayudu Cloth Vendor, Kota Street, Pedda Bazar, Puttapuarthi Anantapur District.

**...Appellant/Accused No.1**

**AND**

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Public Prosecutor, High Court of A.P. through Inspector of Police Puttapuarthi Urban P.S. Anantapur District.

**...Respondent/Complainant**

**Counsel for the Appellant: SRI, T PRADYUMNA KUMAR REDDY**

**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.1214 OF 2012**

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

Originally accused Nos.1 to 4 in Sessions Case No.292 of 2011 on the file of Additional Sessions Judge, Hindupur, were tried for the offences punishable under Sections 302 r/w 109 of Indian Penal Code (for short "I.P.C."). By its judgment dated 30.10.2012, the learned Additional Sessions Judge while acquitting accused Nos.2 to 4 for the offence punishable under Sections 302 r/w. 109 of I.P.C., found accused No.1 guilty for the offence punishable under Section 302 of I.P.C. and sentenced him to suffer rigorous imprisonment for life and to pay a fine of Rs.1000/-, in default, to suffer simple imprisonment for a period of six months. Challenging the same accused No.1 preferred the present Appeal.

The gravamen of the charges against the accused is that on 03.02.2009 at 8.00 P.M., accused No.1, at the instigation of accused Nos.2 to 4, is said to have caused the death of his wife-Vadde Lakshmidevi (the deceased), by pouring kerosene and setting her on fire.

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

Accused Nos.1, 2 and 4 are residents of Puttaparthi Town, whereas accused No.3 is a resident of Diguvaipalli Thanda near Kodikanda Check Post. Accused Nos. 2 to 4 are the friends of accused No.1. P.Ws. 1 and 2 are husband and wife and are



known to deceased and accused No.1. P.W.4 is son of the owner of house, who let his house on rent to the deceased and accused No.1. P.W.5 is the wife of P.W.3, while P.W.6 is owner of the hotel, who took the deceased to the hospital in an ambulance. P.W.8 is the maternal uncle of the deceased and P.W.9 is the mother of the deceased, while P.W.10 is another daughter of P.W.9, P.W.11 is the son of P.W.10. P.Ws.12 and 13 are the son and daughter of the deceased respectively.

The deceased was given in marriage to one Gangadhar of Bathalapalli Village and out of their wedlock P.Ws.12 and 13 were born. After the birth of P.W.13, the husband of deceased deserted his wife and started living with some other lady. Later, the deceased started living at Yenumulapalli Village along with her children. The deceased was doing cooli work and was also running a petty bunk. It is said that accused No.1 developed illegal intimacy with deceased and both of them started staying at Puttaparthi. After sometime, accused No.1 got addicted to vices and started harassing the deceased by demanding money.

On the date of incident, there was a galata between the accused No.1 and the deceased with regard to gold and cash. Accused Nos.2 to 4 claimed to have been present there at the time of incident, but however, after they left, accused No.1 beat the deceased, poured kerosene and set her on fire. Immediately thereafter, the injured was shifted to Community Health Centre, Penukonda, where P.W.23-Dr. Tyagaraju, the Civil Assistant Surgeon, examined her at about 11.30 P.M. and



issued Ex.P.15, the medical intimation. According to P.W.21-  
Judicial First Class Magistrate, Penukonda, on receipt of  
medical intimation (Ex.P15), he proceeded to the Government  
Hospital and identified the deceased, Lakshmidevi and found  
her with burn injuries. After ascertaining the mental condition  
of the injured and after obtaining the necessary certification  
from the doctor, he recorded the statement of the injured.  
Ex.P.16 is the statement recorded by him, which commenced at  
11.45 P.M. and concluded at 12.25 A.M.

On the same day at about 11.25 P.M., P.W.22-Head  
Constable of Penukonda Police Station, received Ex.P15-  
Medical Intimation from the Government Hospital, Penukonda  
for recording the statement of injured. Immediately, he rushed  
to the Government Hospital and found the injured lying with  
burn injuries. After recording the statement, he said to have  
read over the contents of the statement to the injured, to which  
she admitted the same to be true and then obtained left hand  
thumb impression of the injured. The statement recorded by  
him is placed on record as Ex.P17. The said statement was  
said to have recorded by him from 11.40 P.M. to 12.10 A.M. He  
also obtained endorsement of the doctor with regard to the  
mental state of the injured which is placed on record as Ex.P18.  
According to him, the injured was conscious and coherent while  
recording the statement. At about 2.30 A.M. he received the  
death intimation of the injured which is placed on record as  
Ex.P.19. Basing on the intimation, he sent Exs.P.17 to P.19 to



Puttaparthi Urban Police Station on point of jurisdiction. Basing on the said statement, P.W.24, the Inspector of Police, Puttaparthi Airport P.S., registered the same as a case in Crime No.12 of 2009 for the offence punishable under Section 302 IPC. Ex.P.21 is the F.I.R. P.W.24 then proceeded to the scene of offence at about 8.00 A.M. and in the presence of Panchayatdars - P.W.17 and P.W.19, he seized (i) empty kerosene stove (ii) burnt hairs (iii) burnt blouse pieces (iv) burnt petty coat piece (light blue colour) (v) burnt rose colour saree pieces and (vi) one silver basin under the cover of Ex.P.22 the scene of offence observation Mahazar. He also prepared a rough sketch which is placed on record as Ex.P.23. He examined P.Ws.1 to 3 and 5 and recorded their statements. From the scene of offence, P.W.24 proceeded to the Government Hospital, Penukonda and found the dead body in the mortuary. In the presence of blood relations of the deceased, P.W.20 conducted inquest over the body of the deceased from 10.00 A.M. to 1.00 P.M. During inquest, he examined P.W.9, mother of the deceased, and family members of the deceased. On 04.02.2009, P.W.23 conducted autopsy over the dead body of the deceased and issued Ex.P.20- Post Mortem Examination Report opining that the cause of death was due to Neurogenic and Hypobolumic shock due to extensive burns. On 06.02.2009, while P.W.24 was proceeding along with staff from Puttaparthi to Puttaparthi airport, on the way he found one person sitting on the bridge in front of Ujwala apartment main gate and on



seeing them he tried to escape. Suspecting the said person, he apprehended and identified him as accused No.1 in this case. On questioning, he said to have confessed about the commission of offence. After completing the formalities, he was produced before the Judicial First Class Magistrate, Penukonda seeking judicial remand.

After collecting all the necessary documents, a charge sheet was laid against all the accused for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 109 r/w 34 IPC in the court of the Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Penukonda. The learned Magistrate took cognizance of the same for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 109 r/w 34 IPC. On appearance of the accused, copies of documents relied by the prosecution were duly furnished to the accused and on considering the material on record, the learned Magistrate committed the case, under Section 209 Cr.P.C., to the Court of Session, Sessions Division, Anantapur, as the offence is punishable under Section 302 of I.P.C, which is exclusively triable by the Court of Session, where it came to be numbered as Sessions Case No.292 of 2011.

On appearance of all the accused and on hearing both sides and considering the material brought on record, charges as referred to above came to be framed, read over and explained to them to which the accused pleaded not guilty and claimed to be tried.





In order to substantiate its case, the prosecution examined P.Ws.1 to 24, and got marked Exs.P.1 to P.23 and M.Os.1 to 6. Out of the 24 witnesses examined by the prosecution, P.Ws.1 to 7, 14 to 19 did not support the prosecution case and they were declared hostile. After completing the prosecution evidence, the accused 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. No oral evidence was adduced on behalf of the accused except placing on record the contradiction in the evidence of P.W. 9 as Ex.D-1.

Basing on the two dying declarations recorded by the Head Constable and the learned Magistrate, the trial Court while acquitting accused Nos. 2 to 4, convicted the accused No.1 and sentenced him as aforementioned. Challenging the said conviction and sentence, the present appeal came to be filed by the appellant - accused No.1.

The main ground urged by the learned counsel for the appellant is that the two dying declarations, Exs.P.16 and P.17, are relied upon to convict the accused No.1, and that it is very difficult to believe as to how both the dying declarations came to be recorded at the same time when the oral evidence is otherwise. He further pleads that the contents of two dying declarations, one recorded by the Magistrate and the other recorded by the Head Constable, not only proved that the same





are in violation of Rule 33 of Criminal Rules of Practice, but also indicates that the deceased was not in a fit state of mind to give statements.

On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor would contend that even if the dying declaration recorded by the Head Constable is eschewed from consideration, still, the dying declaration recorded by the learned Magistrate can be relied upon, since there is no animosity or ill-will for the learned Magistrate to speak falsehood against the accused. He further submits that the contention of the learned counsel for the appellant with regard to taking out of a computerized statement in the laptop, must have been only for convenience and that no credence can be given to it.

The only point that arises for consideration is whether the evidence on record is sufficient to convict accused No.1-appellant for the offence punishable under Section 302 IPC?

As stated by us earlier, all the material witnesses viz P.Ws.1 to 7, 14 to 19 did not support the case of prosecution and were declared hostile. The other witnesses, P.Ws.8 to 13 are the inquestdars, who took the injured to the hospital, and the blood relations of the deceased. They were examined to prove about the family life of the deceased and the alleged harassment by the accused. P.W.8, a resident of Yenumulapalli village, in his evidence, deposed that there was a galata between the accused No.1 and the deceased, earlier to the incident in question, with regard to gold and cash and at that



time accused Nos.2 to 4 were also present. After accused Nos.2 to 4 left the company of accused No.1, accused No.1 poured kerosene on the deceased and set her on fire with match-stick resulting in burn injuries. Immediately, he shifted the injured to the Government Hospital, Penukonda where she succumbed to death while undergoing treatment. Though in his evidence-in-chief, he stated as if he witnessed the incident, but the answers elicited in the cross examination falsifies the same. In the cross-examination, he admits that one Anand, C.I. of Police, came to his house on the following day and informed him about the said facts. Basing on the information given by the C.I. of Police, he disclosed about the incident to the police during his examination under Section 161 Cr.P.C. Therefore, we feel that no credence can be given to the version of this witness.

P.W.9 is the mother of the deceased. In her evidence, she deposed about the marriage of the deceased with one Gangadhar, who deserted her, as he developed illegal intimacy with some other woman. Since then, the deceased was staying with P.W.9 along with her two children at Yenumulapalli Village. It is said that the deceased was eking out her livelihood by doing collie work and was maintaining her two children. She was also running a petty bunk. Subsequently, the deceased developed illegal intimacy with accused No.1 and both of them were staying near Puttaparthi Airport. It is her version that the deceased and accused No.1 happily lived together for some days and later disputes arose between them. Her



evidence further discloses that on coming to know about the incident through police, herself and family members rushed to the Government Hospital, Penukonda and found the deceased dead due to burn injuries. According to her, accused No.1 poured kerosene on the deceased and set fire. However, in the cross examination, she admits that the police came to her at 1.30 A.M. on the date of incident and informed her that all the accused caused burn injuries to her daughter and she was taking treatment in a Government Hospital and asked her to go over to Penukonda. From the above evidence, it is clear that her source of information with regard to the harassment of the deceased by the accused and the involvement of four persons in the commission of offence was only through police. Therefore, her evidence is only hearsay i.e., the information furnished by police at 1.30 A.M., pursuant to which, she proceeded to the Hospital.

P.W.10 is the sister of the deceased, who in her evidence, speaks about her sister developing illegal intimacy with accused No.1 and about accused No.1 pouring kerosene on the person of the deceased and setting fire, leading to her death. According to her, on receipt of information, she rushed to the hospital and found her sister dead. Though she deposed that it was accused No.1, who poured kerosene on the deceased, but she is neither an eye witness to the incident nor did the deceased inform her about the incident. Her evidence is also silent as to the source of her information.



P.W.11 is the elder brother of the deceased. According to him, the deceased was given in marriage to one Gangadhar of Bathalapalli and out of their wedlock P.Ws.12 and 13 were born. After referring to the avocation and the livelihood of the deceased, P.W.11 deposed about the illegal intimacy of the deceased with accused No.1 and both of them living near Airport at Puttaparthi. It is said that the deceased was subjected to ill-treatment and harassment for want of money and subsequently accused No.1 poured kerosene and set her on fire resulting in burn injuries. On coming to know about the same, he rushed to the Government Hospital, Penukonda and found his sister dead due to burn injuries. According to him, accused No.1 is responsible for the incident. But as stated by us in the earlier paragraphs, he has neither witnessed the incident nor did the deceased inform him as to how she received burn injuries. Therefore, his evidence as to the involvement of the accused in the commission of offence is only hearsay and in fact, the source of information for him, to speak about the involvement of accused No.1 in the commission of offence, was also not disclosed.

P.Ws.12 and 13 are the children of the deceased, who are admittedly not eye witnesses to the incident, as they were in a hostel at that time. Both of them were brought to the house after the incident, where they were informed about the incident. These two witnesses speak about the deceased and accused No.1 coming to their school on Parents Day and the



relationship between accused No.1 and the deceased. From the evidence of these witnesses, referred to above, it is clear that none of them have seen the incident and no oral dying declaration was made to them by the deceased. The manner in which the incident took place came to their knowledge only through inmates. Therefore, we are of the view that the evidence of these witnesses is of no help to the prosecution to establish the guilt of the accused.

The next circumstance relied upon by the prosecution is the two dying declarations recorded by P.Ws.21 and 22 vide Exs.P.16 and P.17 respectively. It is to be noted here that a comment has been made stating that both the dying declarations could not have been recorded at the same time by two different authorities, more so, when the evidence clearly discloses that each of them were present when the said dying declarations were recorded by each of the authorities. In order to appreciate the same, it is to be noted that immediately after admission of the deceased in Government Hospital, Penukonda, Ex.P1.15 - medical intimation came to be sent to the police as well as to the Magistrate for recording the dying declaration of the deceased. Pursuant to which, both the learned Magistrate as well as the Head Constable of Penukonda Police Station proceeded to the Hospital for recording the dying declaration. Ex.P.16, recorded by the Magistrate, shows that the recording of statement was commenced at 11.45 P.M. on 03.02.2009 and concluded at 12.25 A.M. on 04.02.2009. Ex.P.17, which is



recorded by P.W.22-Head Constable of Penukonda Police Station also shows that he commenced recording of the statement of the injured at 11.40 P.M. on 03.02.2009 and concluded at 12.10 A.M. on 04.02.2009.

If we see the evidence of P.W.21, he deposed that he took all precautions before recording the statement of injured under Ex.P.16, and except himself, duty doctor, attender and duty nurse, none else were present while recording the statement, which according to him commenced at 11.45 P.M. and concluded at 12.25 A.M. on the intervening night of 03/04.02.2009. That being the position, it is difficult to believe as to how the Head Constable could have commenced recording the statement of the injured at 11.40 P.M. and concluded the same at 12.10 A.M., when the evidence of P.W.21 clearly shows that except the persons referred to above none else were present.

On the other hand, if the evidence of P.W.22-Head Constable is looked into, he, in his cross examination, admits that he started recording the dying declaration at 11.40 P.M. and concluded at 12.10 A.M. and that he, duty nurse, injured and duty doctor were alone present while recording the statement of injured, when the injured disclosed her identity as Vadde Lakshmidēvi. From the evidences of P.Ws.21 and 22, it is evident that both of them commenced recording of dying declaration at the same time and concluded with a variance of five minutes. The evidence of P.W.21 excludes the presence of



P.W.22, while the evidence of P.W.22 excludes the evidence of P.W.21, but the timings recorded on the two dying declarations are the same. Therefore, a doubt arises about the genuineness or otherwise of these two dying declarations.

At this stage, the learned Public Prosecutor would contend that even if the statement recorded by the Head Constable is eschewed for consideration, but still there remains the dying declaration recorded by the Magistrate, which can be believed to base a conviction. It is no doubt true that even if one dying declaration inspires confidence in the mind of the Court, the same can be based to convict the accused. In fact, nothing is suggested to the Magistrate to show that he has animosity or grudge or ill-will to speak falsehood against the accused. But, strangely, his evidence is not inspiring confidence to place reliance on the said dying declaration for more than one reason. According to him, after being satisfied with regard to the mental condition of the deceased, and after the duty doctor certified the mental condition of the injured Lakshmidēvi, he recorded the statement of the injured. In the cross examination, P.W.21 admits that Ex.P.16 is a printed form and also admits how he took it from his laptop. It would be appropriate to extract the relevant portion, which reads as under:

“It is true that the injured Lakshmidēvi stated before me her marriage has been performed 10 years ago, and she further stated before me that her parents are no more. It is true that Ex.P.16 is a printed Form. The witness volunteers he took print out from his lap tap.”





From the admission made by him, it is clear that he took the printed form from his laptop, on which doctor is said to have signed. On perusal of the said dying declaration, which is placed on record as Ex.P.16, the printed form reads as under:

“Present: P.B.V. Koteswara Rao  
Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Penukonda

I received a requisition on 03.02.09 at 11.35 mid-night from Govt., Hospital, Penukonda to record the Dying Declaration of Smt.Lakshmi Devi w/o Ramesh, aged 26 years, resident of Puttaparthi Mandal, admitted in Govt., Hospital, Penukonda. Then I immediately rushed to Govt., Hospital, along with my attender. The patient is identified by the Duty Medical Officer in Female Ward in Govt., Hospital, Penukonda.

Proceedings commenced at 11.45 p.m.

Q.1: What is your name?

Ans: Lakshmi Devi

Q.2: What is your husband's name?

Ans: Ramesh

Q.3: Which is your place?

Ans: My place is Puttaparthi.

Q.4: When your marriage took place?

Ans: About 10 years back.

Q.5: How many children you are having?

Ans: One son, One daughter. Daughter aged 9 years, son aged 8 years. Daughter's name is Anjali and son's name is Balu.

Q.6: Are you having parents?

Ans: Both were died.

Q.7: Do you know who I am?

Ans: No

Q.8: I am Judge. Can you tell what has happened?

Ans: I can

Certification by the Duty Medical Officer.

The Patient is conscious, coherent and in a fit state of mind to give statement.

Sd/- xx xx 12.10 a.m. 4.2.09

Name of the Doctotr:

Designation : Civil Asst., Surgeon

Date: 4.2.09, CAC Penukonda

I recorded the above preliminary question and answers and I am satisfied that the patient is conscious, coherent and in fit state of mind to give statement and the Duty Medical Officer certified the same.

My husband used to drink and beat me. He used to bring others to my house, to test that I am of good character or not. Unable to bear the torture of my husband, on 1<sup>st</sup> of this month I went to the house of my co-daughter-in-law. Today evening about 6.00 p.m. I came to Puttaparthi to take my clothes. When I was packing my clothes about 8.00 p.m. in the night, my husband came to me and asked me to give Rs.2,000/-. Along with him Pothulaiah and Babu also came to my house. I told that I was not having money. Then my husband caught



hold of my tuft, threw me on the floor and hit my head to the floor. Poured kerosene from the stove in the house and lit me with match stick and left the house by closing the doors along with Pothulaiah and Babu. They went in the auto of Pothulaiah. He is harassing me for the past one year.

I recorded the statement of the deponent verbatim and read over the same and explained to her which she admitted as true and correct and I then obtained her LTI.

LTI of Lakshmi Devi

Certification of the Duty Doctor.

The patient is conscious, coherent and in a fit state of mind throughout the recording of the statement.

Sd/- xx xx 12.10 a.m. 4.2.09

Name of the Doctor: Dr. R.Thyagaraju

Designation: Civil Asst., surgeon

Date: 4.2.09, 12.25 a.m.

At the time of recording the proceedings, no one was present except the patient, myself, my attender, the Duty Doctor and the Duty Nurse.

Proceedings concluded at 12.25 a.m. on 4.2.09.

Sd/- P.V.B.Koteswara Rao

Judl., Magistrate of First Class,  
Penukonda.”

After filling the contents in the printed form, the doctor is said to have signed. It is to be noted here that his (PW.21's) evidence is silent as to the presence of printer in the hospital. It is neither his case that he was carrying a printed form nor it is his version that he had utilized the printer in the hospital for taking a print out. One does not know as to how he could obtain a print out from his laptop in hospital. Apart from that, the endorsement of the duty doctor must be only after seeing the injured and on being satisfied with regard to her fit state of mind. But, the print out already has the certification of the doctor stating that “the patient is conscious, coherent and in a fit state of mind to give statement”, under which the doctor signed. Therefore, there was nothing which a doctor had to verify before making endorsement. He only signed on such



endorsement, which, in our view, is not only contrary to the Rule 33 of the Criminal Rules of Practice, but the practice of this nature requires to be condemned. Doubt arises as to whether the doctor examined the patient and applied his mind or whether he simply signed on the print out taken by P.W.21.

If this dying declaration is excluded from consideration, there is no other material to connect accused No.1 with the crime. There is one other reason to doubt the contents of the dying declaration and also to show that the deceased was not in fit state of mind to give statement. The contents of the dying declaration, recorded prior to the certification of Doctor, show that her husband name is Ramesh and that both her parents died, but the prosecution examined the mother of deceased as P.W.9. It has come on record through the evidence of P.W.9 and others that Ramesh is not her husband, but her paramour, while one Gangadhar is her husband and the two children were born through him. Therefore, taking into consideration the totality of the circumstances viz., the manner in which the certificate of doctor was obtained, by taking a print out from laptop and not explaining as to how the print out was taken in the Hospital and the inconsistent answers given by the deceased, we feel that it may not be safe to convict accused No.1 basing on the sole dying declaration recorded by the Magistrate, since the other dying declaration recorded by the Head Constable cannot be accepted as no explanation is given as to how he could record the dying declaration between 11.40



P.M. and 12.10 A.M. when the Magistrate was present in the hospital at the same time recording the statement of the injured.

In the result, the Criminal Appeal is allowed and the conviction and sentence imposed against the appellant-accused No.1 for the offence punishable under Section 302 of I.P.C., in Sessions Case No.292 of 2011 on the file of Additional Sessions Judge, Hindupur, by judgment dated 30.10.2012, are set aside. The appellant-accused No.1 is acquitted and he shall be set at liberty forthwith, if he is not required in any other case. His bail bonds shall stand cancelled.

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 Additional Sessions Judge, Hindupur, Anantapur District (With records, if any)
2. The Station House Officer, Puttaparthi Urban Police Station, Ananthapur District.
3. The Superintendent, Sub Jail, Penukonda, Anantapur District.
4. Two CCs to the Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh (OUT)
5. 9 L.R. Copies.
6. The Under Secretary Union of India, Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, New Delhi.
7. The Secretary, Advocates Association (AP) Library, High Court Buildings, Amaravathi.
8. Two C.D. Copies.
9. The Director General of Police, Vijayawada, Krishna District.
10. One CC to SRI. T. PRADYUMNA KUMAR REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]

Chp 11- The section officer criminal appeal section, High Court of A.P.,  
2



2019:APHC:15835



2019:APHC:15835

HIGH COURT

DATED:21/02/2019

OC  
2/5/19

ORDER

CRLA.No.1214 of 2012

RS. 27.00  
18

Received  
21/4/19

ALLOWING THE CRIMINAL APPEAL

20  
T.S 17/4/2019.

LR