



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH  
AT AMARAVATI  
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

[3521]

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF JANUARY  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 385/2026

**Between:**

1. CHALAGALLA VENKATA RAO, S/O. SURYA RAO, AGED 69 YRS,R/O. D. NO. 7-20/1, MURARI VILLAGE,GANDEPALLI MANDAL,KAKINADA DISTRICT.
2. CHALAGALLA PADMANABHUDU, S/O. SURYA RAO. AGED 63 YRS.R/O. D. NO. 7-20/1, MURARI VILLAGE,GANDEPALLI MANDAL,KAKINADA DISTRICT

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

**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PUBLIC PROSECUTORHIGH COURT, AT AMARAVATHI,
2. PYLA NOOKARAJU, S/O. PENTAYYA, AGED 66 YRS,R/O D NO 5-207, GANDEPALLI VILLAGE MANDAL KAKINADA DISTRICT. 533297

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

Petition under Section 437/438/439/482 of Cr.P.C and 528 of BNSS praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High CourtPleased to call for the records in Crime No. Crime No. 440 / 2025 on the file of Gandepalli Police Station, Kakinada District, and quash the same against the petitioners and pass such other order or .orders as this Honble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

**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 pleased to grant stay of all further proceedings in Crime No. 440 / 2025 on the file of Gandepalli Police Station, Kakinada District including arrest of the petitioners and pas

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

1. T V S PRABHAKARA RAO

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

1. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

**The Court made the following:**

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 396/2026

ORDER:

The Criminal Petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for brevity 'the Cr.P.C.')/Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity 'the BNS') seeking to quash the proceedings against the petitioner Nos.1 and 2/Accused Nos.9 and 10 in Crime No. 440 of 2025 of Gandepalli Police Station, Kakinada District, registered for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 318(2), 336(3)(2), 340(2), 329 (3), 61 (2) read with 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for brevity, the 'BNS'), 175(3) of BNS.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners/accused Nos. 9 and 10 and the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor on behalf of the State. Perused the record.
3. As seen from the record, the alleged offences levelled against the petitioner Nos.1 and 2/Accused Nos. 9 and 10 are punishable with imprisonment for less than seven (07) years.
4. In this regard, it is apposite to mention the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar**<sup>1</sup>, wherein a detailed guidelines were issued at Para Nos.11 and 12, for arresting a person, which are being reproduced herein below:-

*11. Our endeavor in this judgment is to ensure that police officers do not arrest accused unnecessarily and Magistrate do*

---

<sup>1</sup>(2014) 8 SCC 273

*not authorize detention casually and mechanically. In order to ensure what we have observed above, we give the following direction:*

- a).All the State Governments to instruct its police officers not to automatically arrest when a case under Section 498-A of the IPC is registered but to satisfy themselves about the necessity for arrest under the parameters laid down above flowing from Section 41 Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for brevity 'the Cr.P.C.');*
  - b)All police officers be provided with a check list containing specified sub- clauses under Section 41(1)(b)(ii);*
  - c) The police officer shall forward the check list duly filed and furnish the reasons and materials which necessitated the arrest, while forwarding/producing the accused before the Magistrate for further detention;*
  - d) The Magistrate while authorizing detention of the accused shall peruse the report furnished by the police officer in terms aforesaid and only after recording its satisfaction, the Magistrate will authorize detention;*
  - e) The decision not to arrest an accused, be forwarded to the Magistrate within two weeks from the date of the institution of the case with a copy to the Magistrate which may be extended by the Superintendent of police of the district for the reasons to be recorded in writing;*
  - f) Notice of appearance in terms of Section 41-A of Cr.P.C be served on the accused within two weeks from the date of institution of the case, which may be extended by the Superintendent of Police of the District for the reasons to be recorded in writing;*
  - g) Failure to comply with the directions aforesaid shall apart from rendering the police officers concerned liable for departmental action, he shall also be liable to be punished for contempt of court to be instituted before High Court having territorial jurisdiction.*
  - h) Authorizing detention without recording reasons as aforesaid by the judicial Magistrate concerned shall be liable for departmental action by the appropriate High Court.*
12. *We hasten to add that the directions aforesaid shall not only apply to the cases under Section 498-A of the I.P.C. or Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, the case in hand, but also such cases where offence is punishable with imprisonment for a term which may be less than seven years or which may extend to seven years; whether with or without fine.*

5. The similar view is also reiterated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Md. Asfak Alam v. the State of Jharkhand**<sup>2</sup>, which also reiterated the guidelines laid down in the case of *Arnesh Kumar*.

6. In the light of the law laid down in the case of *Arnesh Kumar* and *Md. Asfak Alam*, the investigating officer is under legal obligation to proceed in accordance with law, but he shall follow the procedure prescribed under Sections 41 and 41(A) of 'the Cr.P.C.,' (now Sections 35 and 35(3) of 'the B.N.S.S.,' 2023). The petitioners/accused Nos.9 and 10 are obliged to render their fullest cooperation in the ongoing investigation.

7. In the result, the Criminal Petition is disposed of directing the Investigating Officer to comply with Section 35(3) of 'the BNSS'/41-A of 'the Cr.P.C.,' and to strictly follow the directions issued in the cases of *Arnesh Kumar* and *MD. Asfak Alam*.

As a sequel, Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall stand closed.

---

DR. Y. LAKSHMANA RAO, J

Date: 22.01.2026  
KKV

---

<sup>2</sup>(2023) 8 SCC 632

**THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO**

**CRIMINAL PETITION No.385 of 2026**

Dated 22.01.2026

KKV

**HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH:: AMARAVATI**

**MAIN CASE NO.: CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 385/2026**

**PROCEEDING SHEET**

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
2	22.01.2026	<p><b><u>Dr.YLR,J</u></b></p> <p>The Criminal Petition is disposed of.</p> <p><i>(Vide separate order)</i></p> <p><i>KKV</i></p>	<p><b><u>Dr.YLR, J</u></b></p>