OFFICE OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE:: KURNOOL

Dis.No: 7008 /Estt/2024 Dated 19-11-2024

Letter ROC No.534/SO/2024, dated 13-11-2024 of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh along with order, dated 28-10-2024 of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh, passed in Criminal Petition No.6807 of 2024, is herewith communicated for information and necessary action.

All the Judicial Officers working in Kurnool District are requested to download the Letter ROC No.534/SO/2024, dated 13-11-2024 of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh along with order, dated 28-10-2024 of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh, passed in Criminal Petition No.6807 of 2024, from the District Court website i.e., website i.e., **https://kurnool.dcourts.gov.in**., for information and necessary action.

All the Judicial Officers are requested to submit the compliance report after downloading the above copy without fail.

PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE,
KURNOOL.

To,

All the Judicial Officers in Kurnool District.

The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority, Kurnool.

The Senior Superintendent (Accounts), Principal District Court, Kurnool.
The Stenographer Grade-I, Principal District Court, Kurnool.
The Translator/Superintendent, Principal District Court, Kurnool.
The Civil Bench Clerk, Principal District Court, Kurnool.

The System Officer, District Court, Kurnool, with a direction to upload the same in the District Court's Official website.

Dr. Y. LAKSHMANA RAO
REGISTRAR GENERAL

AMARAVATI
(Off) :0863 2372613
(Telefax):0863 2372631

ROC No.534/SO/2024 **Dated 13.11.2024**

To
All the Principal District Judges
in Andhra Pradesh.

Sir/Madam,

Sub: High Court of Andhra Pradesh – Order dated 28.10.2024 of High Court of Andhra Pradesh, passed in Criminal Petition No. 6807 of 2024 -- Forwarded for information and necessary action – Forwarded -- Reg.

Ref: Order dated 28.10.2024 of High Court of Andhra Pradesh, passed in Criminal Petition No. 6807 of 2024.

*****

Adverting to the subject and reference cited, as directed, I am to forward herewith the copy of Order dated 28.10.2024 of High Court of Andhra Pradesh, passed in Criminal Petition No. 6807 of 2024, for information and necessary action.

Further, I also request you communicate the same to all the Judicial Officers in your Unit and to the Presiding Officers of Labour Courts/Tribunals in the District working under the control of the High Court, for information and compliance.

Yours sincerely,
Y. Lakshmana Rao
13/11/24
REGISTRAR GENERAL

Encl: As stated.

R.No-8875
18/11/24

2339

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

MONDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FOUR

PRESENT

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B.V.L.N. CHAKRAVARTHI

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 6807 OF 2024

Between:

Mr. K.V.R.Vidyasagar, S/o. Late Nageswra Rao, Aged 45 years, R/a. H.No.1-100, Kosuru Village, Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh.

...Petitioner/Accused No.1

AND

1. The State Of Andhra Pradesh, Rep by the P.P., A.P High Court, Station House Officer, Inspector of Police Ibrahima patnam Police Station, NTR Police Commissionerate, Vijayawada.
2. Dr. Kadambari Narendra Kumar Jethwani, D/o Narendra Kumar Jethwani, R/o A-602, Ideal Apartments, Gulmohar Road, Juhu, Mumbai.

...Respondent/Defacto-Complainant

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to a) Pass Necessary orders and direction thereby setting aside quashing of the impugned order dated 23.09.2024 passed by the Ld. IV-Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada in Crime No.4691 of 2024 and all consequently proceedings thereto, and hereby hold the arrest of the petitioner as illegal.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2024

Petition under Section 528 BNSS and (U/s 482 of Cr.P.C) is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Pass necessary orders and directions, thereby directing that the application dated 23.09.2024 Crl.M.P. No. 4187/2024 in Cr.No. 469/2024, filed by the respondent before the Ld. Chief Judicial Magistrate seeking Police Custody of the petitioner should not be heard till the pendency of the present petition as the same will perpetuate the illegality.

I.A. NO: 3 OF 2024

Petition under Section 528 of BNSS and (U/s 482 of Cr.P.C) is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition, the High Court may be pleased to Pass necessary orders and directions, granting ad-interim orders thereby releasing the petitioner till the pendency of the captioned petition in terms of Law laid down by the Hon'ble supreme Court in Arnab Manoranjao Goswami Vs. the Satte of A.P Maharashtra & Ors. In Criminal Appeal No. 742 of 2020

This Petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Memorandum of Grounds of Criminal Petition and upon hearing the arguments of Sri Y N Vivekananda, Advocate for the Petitioner and the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Respondent No.1 and of Sri Srinivasa Rao Narra, Advocate for the Respondent No. 2

The Court made the following ORDER:-

APHC010422442024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3368]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THIS THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FOUR

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B V L N CHAKRAVARTHI

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 6807/2024

Between:

Mr. KVR Vidyasagar **...PETITIONER/ACCUSED**

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others **...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused:

1. Y N VIVEKANANDA

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant(S):

1. SRINIVASA RAO NARRA
2. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

The Court made the following:

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

****

CRIMINAL PETITION No.6807 OF 2024

Between:

Mr.K.V.R.Vidya Sagar, S/o.Late Nageswara Rao,
Aged 45 years, R/o.H.No.1-100, Kosuru Village,
Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh.

… Petitioner

Versus

1.The State of Andhra Pradesh, represented by
Public Prosecutor, Andhra Pradesh High Court,
Station House Officer, Inspector of Police,
Ibrahimpatnam Police Station,
NTR Commissonerate, Vijayawada.

2. Dr.Kadambari Narendra Kumar Jethwani,
D/o.Narendra Kumar Jethwani,
R/o.A-602, Ideal Apartments,
Gulmohar Road, Zuhu, Mumbai. ..Respondents

DATE OF ORDER PRONOUNCED : 28.10.2024.

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B.V.L.N.CHAKRAVARTHI

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the Order? Yes/No

2. Whether the copy of Order may be marked to Law Reporters/Journals? Yes/No

3. Whether His Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the Order? Yes/No

JUSTICE B.V.L.N.CHAKRAVARTHI

*** THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B.V.L.N.CHAKRAVARTHI**

+ CRIMINAL PETITION No.6807 OF 2024

% 28.10.2024

Between:

Mr.K.V.R.Vidya Sagar, S/o.Late Nageswara Rao,
Aged 45 years, R/o.H.No.1-100, Kosuru Village,
Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh.

… Petitioner

Versus

1.The State of Andhra Pradesh, represented by
Public Prosecutor, Andhra Pradesh High Court,
Station House Officer, Inspector of Police,
Ibrahimpatnam Police Station,
NTR Commissonerate, Vijayawada.

2. Dr.Kadambari Narendra Kumar Jethwani,
D/o.Narendra Kumar Jethwani,
R/o.A-602, Ideal Apartments,
Gulmohar Road, Zuhu, Mumbai.

! Counsel for the petitioner : Sri Y.N.Vivekananda

^ Counsel for the Respondent No.1/State. : Learned Advocate General.

^ Counsel for the Respondent No.2/Complainant. Sri N.Srinivasa Rao.

< Gist:

> Head Note:

? Cases referred:

1. **Madhu Limaye Vs. State of Maharashtra reported in 1969 (1) SCC 292.**
2. **Gautam Navlakha Vs. National Investigation Agency reported in 2022 (13) SCC 542.**
3. **Pankaj Bansal Vs. Union of India and others reported in 2024 (3) SCC 576.**
4. **Prabir Purkayastha Vs. State of NCT of Delhi reported in 2024 SCC Online SC 934.**
5. **Aravind Kejriwal Vs. Directorate of Enforcement reported in 2024 INSC 512.**
6. **Mahesh Pandurang Naik Vs. The State of Maharashtra and another reported in 2024 BHC-AS:28603:DB.**
7. **Hem Prabhakar Shah Vs. The State of Maharashtra reported in 2024: BHC-AS:36016-DB.**
8. **Vijay Madanlal Choudhary and others Vs. Union of India and others reported in 2022 SCC On Line SC 929.**
9. **Ram Kishore Arora Vs. Directorate of Enforcement reported in 2024 (7) SCC 599.**

10. **Jitteboina Guravaiah and another Vs. Officer on Special Duty, Anti-Naxalite Squad, Kothagudem and others reported in 1999 (3) ALT 672.**

11. **D.K.Basu Vs. State of West Bengal reported in 1997 (1) SCC 416.**

This Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B.V.L.N.CHAKRAVARTHI

CRIMINAL PETITION No.6807 OF 2024

O R D E R:

The petition is filed U/s.528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as 'BNSS'), to set aside the order dated 23.09.2024 passed by the learned IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada, in Cr.No.469/2024 of Ibrahimpatnam Police Station, Vijayawada City, and consequently, release the petitioner forthwith, unless he is required in any other case.

02. Heard Sri T.Niranjan Reddy, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Sri Y.N.Vivekananda, learned counsel for petitioner, learned Advocate General representing the State/1st respondent and Sri N.Srinivasa Rao, learned counsel for unofficial respondent No.2/complainant.

03. The petition is voluminous and run 100 pages. The petitioner raised several grounds both on facts and in law. It contains extracts of various provisions of law, facts of the case culled out of records from the present case and other cases. It also contains extracts from the judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court and High Courts. Therefore, become voluminous. It is made clear that, at this point, this Court is not

concerned with the merits of the facts in terms of the involvement of the petitioner in the alleged offence.

04. During arguments, Sri T.Niranjan Reddy, learned Senior Counsel and learned Advocate General informed that they would confine arguments to the aspect whether respondents/police informed the grounds of arrest to the petitioner, as laid under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and Section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023. Accordingly, the learned Senior Counsel, the learned Advocate General representing the State and the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent/complainant submitted arguments on that aspect itself. Therefore, this Court refers only to the facts and law which are relevant and necessary to decide the said question and pass an order.

05. **BRIEF FACTS**:

The 2nd respondent presented a written report to the Ibrahimpatnam Police Station on 13.09.2024 alleging that on 03.02.2024, police arrested her at Mumbai in connection with Cr.No.90/2024 of Ibrahimpatnam Police Station alleging that she committed offences U/secs.384, 385, 386, 388, 420, 467, 468, 120-B r/w.34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as IPC)

and produced her before the Magistrate at Mumbai, and she further alleged that she was harassed during transit remand on the way to Vijayawada;

06. The complainant further alleged that she was implicated falsely in the said cases for the reasons and circumstances mentioned in her complaint; Several allegations were made against the present petitioner and others that certain documents were fabricated by forgery etc; Ibrahimpatnam Police basing on her complaint, registered a case in Cr.No.469/2024 on 13.09.2024 for the offences U/secs.192, 211, 218, 220, 354(D), 467, 420, 469, 471 r/w. 120-(B) of I.P.C. and section 66 (A) of I.T Act, 2000 showing the petitioner as A-1, and others.

07. The remand report dated 23.09.2024 (Annexure-27 of the petition) in the case would mention that during investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 20.09.2024 at 06.30 hours near Tree of Life Resort, Bharathwala, Bisht Gaon, Rajpur, Dehradun, Uttarakand State, and provided arrest intimation to the petitioner; also furnished arrest intimation to Sri N.Bhanu Prasad, cousin of the petitioner as laid down U/s.36(b) of BNSS, 2023, (50 (2) of Cr.P.C., 1973); the petitioner was produced before the Magistrate at Dehradun on 20.09.2024 at

04.30 p.m. for transit warrant, as the place of arrest was far away from Ibrahimpatnam, Vijayawada; and it may take some time to produce the accused before the learned IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada, within the stipulated time; Learned III Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dehradun, passed transit remand order dated 20.09.2024, granting transit remand (Annexure-26 of the petition and Annexure-6 of the Counter); Thereafter, the respondent/police produced the petitioner before the jurisdictional Magistrate at Vijayawada i.e., IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada, on 23.09.2024 at 02.00 a.m. (Annexure-27 of the petition); The learned counsel for petitioner filed detailed objections (Annexure-28 of the petition), opposing the remand of the petitioner before the learned Magistrate; Thereupon, the learned Magistrate vide order dated 23.09.2024 (Annexure-1 of the petition) overruled the objections, observed that the police complied with the mandatory provisions as contemplated under law. He held that on perusal of the material, which includes complaint, 161 Cr.P.C. statements of the witnesses makes out prima facie accusation against the petitioner for the offence U/secs.193, 195, 211, 218, 467, 471, 166, 167, 342, 120-B r/w.34 I.P.C; Therefore, remanded the petitioner to judicial custody as per section 187 of BNSS 2023, (167(2) of Cr.P.C.).

Hence, the present petition came to be filed challenging the above order of the learned IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada, on the ground that police did not provide grounds of arrest as enunciated in Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India, and police failed to follow sections 47(1) of BNSS 2023, (50(1) Cr.P.C.); and therefore, the remand order is vitiated for failure of compliance of the Constitutional mandate; hence, the petitioner shall be set at liberty forthwith.

08. **SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER**:

Sri T.Niranjan Reddy, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner strenuously contended that the Investigation Officer did not communicate the grounds of arrest as laid down in Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023. The learned Senior Counsel vehemently argued that in the light of following judgments of Hon'ble Apex Court and High Courts, the remand order would stand vitiated.

1. **Madhu Limaye Vs. State of Maharashtra**[1]

2. **Gautam Navlakha Vs. National Investigation Agency**[2]

[1] 1969 (1) SCC 292

[2] 2022 (13) SCC 542

3. **Pankaj Bansal Vs. Union of India and others**[3]

4. **Prabir Purkayastha Vs. State of NCT of Delhi**[4]

5. **Aravind Kejriwal Vs. Directorate of Enforcement**[5]

6. **Mahesh Pandurang Naik Vs. The State of Maharashtra and another**[6]

7. **Hem Prabhakar Shah Vs. The State of Maharashtra**[7].

09. The learned Senior Counsel further contended that the grounds of arrest shall be furnished to the arrested person as a matter of course, and without any exception to give true meaning and purpose to the Constitutional and Statutory mandate of Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023.

10. The learned Senior Counsel fervently argued on the contention of the respondent/police that the petitioner was informed of the grounds of his arrest complying to the mandate of Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India. He submitted that "*no person, who is arrested shall be detained in*

---

[3] **2024 (3) SCC 576**

[4] **2024 SCC Online SC 934**

[5] **2024 INSC 512**

[6] **2024 BHC-AS:28603:DB**

[7] **2024: BHC-AS:36016-DB**

custody without being informed, as soon as may be, of the grounds for such arrest, *and the mode of conveying information of the grounds of arrest must necessarily be meaningful so as to serve the intended purpose to enable the person arrested to oppose the remand and seek release on bail*".

11. He would further submit that the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Pankaj Bansal's** case held that "there is no valid reason as to why a copy of such written grounds of arrest should not be furnished to the arrested person as a matter of course and without exception and there are two primary reasons as to why this would be the advisable course of information to be followed as a matter of principle. Firstly, in the event of such grounds of arrest are orally read out to the arrested person, or read by such person wound nothing further, and if this fact is disputed in a given case, it may boiled down to the word of the arrested person against the word of Authorised Officer/Investigation Officer as to whether or not there is due and proper compliance in this regard". In the case on hand, though the Investigation Officer claims that grounds of arrest were informed to the petitioner, no material is available on record to substantiate it. The transit remand order passed by the learned Magistrate at Dehradun on 20.09.2024, or the remand report placed

before the learned IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada, on 23.09.2024 or the order of the learned IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada, does not establish that the grounds of arrest were informed/communicated to the petitioner soon after the arrest; A specific objection was raised in the objections filed before the learned IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada, in this regard, but no observation was made in the impugned order, under challenge.

12. The learned Senior Counsel would contend that in the counter filed by the 1st respondent, a document styled as 'copy of arrest intimation to the accused dated 20.09.2024' (Annexure-3 of the counter) was filed. But there was no mention about this document in the list of documents shown in the remand report dated 23.09.2024, nor any reference in the order of the learned Magistrate. In the counter of the 1st respondent an attempt was made to contend that at the stage of seeking remand, full particulars of offence, for which petitioner was arrested is sufficient compliance as per section 47(1) BNSS, 2023 and Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India. It indicates that the Investigation Officer intends to say that the petitioner was informed of full particulars of the offence before remand on 23.09.2024. Said contention suggests that the arrest intimation dated 20th September, 2024 produced before

this Court could be an afterthought by police to wriggle out from the situation i.e., non-compliance of Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023.

13. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the above document contains information about sections of law and name of the complainant only, it did not contain basic facts of the case to comply Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India. Even if it is presumed for the sake of arguments that a copy of the above document was provided to the accused, it is not a due compliance, as laid down under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023.

14. The learned Senior Counsel for petitioner would further submit that in **Prabir Purkayastha's** case, the Hon'ble Apex Court observed that *the grounds of arrest informed must convey all basic facts, on which he was being arrested, so as to provide him an opportunity of defending himself against custodial remand and to seek bail and thus, the grounds of arrest would invariably be personal to the accused and cannot be equated with the 'reasons of arrest', which are general in nature*.

15. The learned Senior Counsel would further submit that in the matter of Madhu Limaye and others, it was held that "*it is necessary for the State to establish that, at the stage of remand, that the grounds of arrest was communicated to the accused. Therefore, the non-compliance of Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India, the arrest itself is unconstitutional and the remand would not cure the constitutional infirmities attached to such arrest*". Therefore, the remand order under challenge is vitiated and the accused be set at liberty forthwith.

16. **SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS**:

Per contra, the learned Advocate General representing State strenuously contended that there is no dispute that the petitioner was arrested on 20.09.2024 at Dehradun. He was produced before the learned III Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dehradun seeking transit remand warrant, as it may take time to produce the accused before jurisdictional Magistrate at Vijayawada. The copy of remand order of the learned Magistrate at Dehradun contained the signature of the petitioner. It would establish that it was supplied to the accused along with a copy of the FIR.

17. He would further submit that column 8 of 'Arrest/Court Surrender Form' prepared on 20.09.2024 at the time of producing the petitioner before Magistrate at Dehradun, would show that the petitioner was informed of the grounds of arrest, apart from his legal rights. It contained the signature of the accused.

18. The learned Advocate General in support of his arguments relied on 'Arrest/Court Surrender Form' (Annexure-4 of the counter). He pointed out that the said form also contained the signature of the learned Magistrate at Dehradun. Said document provided to the petitioner in compliance with section 36(b) of BNSS, 2023, as the arrest of the petitioner was informed to his cousin Mr.N.Bhanu Prasad on 20.09.2024.

19. The learned Advocate General vehemently contended that the arguments of the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner on the arrest intimation form U/s.47(1) of BNSS, 2023 (copy of arrest intimation to accused) (Annexure-3 of the counter) are not correct. It also contained the signature of the accused. There is no dispute about the same. It would show that it was provided to the accused on 20.09.2024. It shows the details of the penal provisions, complainant name, crime details etc., and copy of FIR provided to the petitioner along with this document. It

would establish that grounds of arrest contain basic facts of offence alleged against the petitioner. Therefore, Article 22(1) of the Constitution as well section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023 were complied with on 20-09-2024 at Dehradun itself.

20. Learned Advocate General also contended that the judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the cases of **Pankaj Bansal** and **Prabir Purkayastha** relied on by the learned Senior Counsel for petitioner deal with compliance of twin conditions under section 19 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 and section 43(B) of The Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967. Therefore, in view of the stringent provisions laid down U/s.19 of The Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 and section 43(B) of The Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act 1967, for seeking bail, the Hon'ble Apex Cour made certain observations with reference to those provisions and compliance as pointed out by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner. However, fairly submitted that undisputedly, compliance with the Constitutional mandate of Article 22(1), and section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023 is mandatory and they shall be fulfilled by the Investigation Officer effecting arrest for of offence under IPC or BNS or any other Act.

21. A three judges bench of Hon'ble Apex Court in **Vijay Madanlal Choudhary and others Vs. Union of India and others**[8], observed that "*the safeguards to be adhered to by the jurisdictional Police Officer before effecting arrest as stipulated in the 1973 Code, are certainly not comparable to section 19 of PMLA, 2002*". In the case on hand, the material placed before the Court establishes prima facie that the petitioner was informed of grounds of arrest on 20.09.2024. Hence, the counsel for petitioner could file detailed objections running 100 pages, before the learned Magistrate at Vijayawada, opposing remand. It would establish that since the accused was provided with grounds of arrest at Dehradun, the counsel prepared such a voluminous objections at Vijayawada on 23-09-2024. Otherwise, it is impossible to prepare it in a short time, unless grounds of arrest were provided on 20-09-2024. Hence the contention that Investigation Officer did not comply with the Constitutional Mandate under Article 22(1) of The Constitution of India and section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023 was only introduced to delay or avoid the police custody, for reasons best known to the accused.

[8] **2022 SCC On Line SC 929**

22. The learned Advocate General would further submit that the learned Magistrate in the impugned remand order considered the objections raised by the counsel for petitioner, and categorically observed that "police have complied with mandatory provisions as contemplated under law". Therefore, merely because, there is no specific reference to Annexure-3 in the documents enclosed in the remand report, it cannot be doubted. In those circumstances, there are no grounds to quash the order under challenge.

23. The learned Advocate General would further submit that 'copy of court surrender form' and 'copy of arrest intimation to the accused' i.e., Annexures-2 and 3 of the counter would establish that the grounds of arrest were communicated to the petitioner on 20.09.2024 at Dehradun, soon after the arrest complying the Constitutional mandate.

24. The learned Advocate General relied on the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in **Ram Kishore Arora Vs. Directorate of Enforcement**[9], that the phrase 'as soon as may be' was considered by the Hon'ble Apex Court. It was held that it must be performed as soon as possible, at the outer most within 24 hours of arrest. In the case on hand, the

[9] 2024 (7) SCC 599

petitioner was arrested on 20.09.2024. Above facts establish that on the same day, he was communicated with the grounds of arrest. Therefore, Article 22(1) of the Constitution as well as section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023 were complied with. Hence, there are no grounds to quash the remand order dated 23.09.2024 passed by the learned IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada.

25. In the light of rival arguments advanced stated supra, bone of the contention of the petitioner is that the grounds of arrest were not informed to him either orally or in writing, and therefore, it amounts to gross violation of the constitutional mandate under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India, and statutory direction under section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023 (Section 50(2) Cr.P.C, 1973) and therefore, the petitioner shall be released forthwith.

26. The crux of the arguments of the learned Advocate General is that the facts of the case vividly show that the petitioner was informed of the grounds of arrest, in writing on the date of arrest itself i.e., on 20.09.2024. Hence, there was no violation of Constitutional mandate under Article 22(1) of the Constitution as well section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023.

27. In the light of above rival contentions, the point for consideration is as under:

> "***Whether the petitioner was informed of the grounds of arrest as mandated under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023***?"

28. **POINT**:

Sri T.Niranjan Reddy, learned Senior Counsel for petitioner placed much reliance on the judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **In-re Madhu Limaye Vs. State of Maharashtra, Pankaj Bansal Vs. Union of India** and **Prabir Purkayastha Vs. State of NCT of Delhi**. Constitutional mandate declared by Apex Court in the above judgements is that "***Any Officer arresting a person for any offence, as soon as may be informed him/her of grounds of arrest, as laid down in Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and it is a safeguard to a person arrested on charges of committing an offence. Further, the arrested person be informed of the grounds of arrest in writing. It must be applied pari passu to a person arrested in a case under any law. Any infringement of this fundamental right would vitiate the process of arrest and remand***".

29. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Madhu Limaye Vs. State of Maharashtra** also held that "*Article 22(1) embodies a rule which has always been regarded as vital and fundamental for safeguarding personal liberty in all legal systems where the rule of law prevails*".

30. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Pankaj Bansal's case**, which relates to an offence under Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 observed that in Madhu Limaye's case a three judge bench observed that "*it would be necessary for the State to establish that, at the stage of remand, Magistrate directed detention in jail custody after applying his mind to all relevant matters and if the arrest suffered on the ground of violation of Article 22(1) of the Constitution, the order of remand would not cure the constitutional infirmities attaching to such arrest*".

31. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Pankaj Bansal's case**, at para 37 observed that "*no doubt in Vijay Madanlal Choudhary, this Court held that non-supply of the ECIR in a given case cannot be found fault with, as the ECIR may contain details of the material in ED's possession and revealing the same may have a deleterious impact on the final outcome of the investigation or inquiry. Having held so, this Court affirmed that so long as the person is "informed" of the ground of his/her arrest, that*

would be sufficient compliance with the mandate of Article 22(1) of the Constitution".

32. The Hon'ble Apex Court at para 38 observed that "*in this regard, we may note that Article 22(1) of the Constitution provides, inter alia, that no person who is arrested shall be detained in custody without being informed, as soon as may be, of the grounds for such arrest. This being the fundamental right guaranteed to the arrested person, the mode of conveying information of the grounds of arrest must necessarily be meaningful so as to serve the intended purpose. It may be noted that Section 45 of the Act of 2002 enables the person arrested under Section 19 thereof to seek release on bail but it postulates that unless the twin conditions prescribed thereunder are satisfied, such a person would not be entitled to grant of bail. The twin conditions set out in the provision are that, firstly, the Court must be satisfied, after giving an opportunity to the public prosecutor to oppose the application for release, that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the arrested person is not guilty of the offence and, secondly, that he is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. To meet this requirement, it would be essential for the arrested person to be aware of the grounds on which the authorized officer arrested him/her under Section 19 and the basis for the officer's*

'reason to believe' that he/she is guilty of an offence punishable under the Act of 2002. It is only if the arrested person has knowledge of these facts that he/she would be in a position to plead and prove before the Special Court that there are grounds to believe that he/she is not guilty of such offence, so as to avail the relief of bail. Therefore, communication of the grounds of arrest, as mandated by Article 22(1) of the Constitution and Section 19 of the Act of 2002, is meant to serve this higher purpose and must be given due importance".

33. The Hon'ble Apex Court referring to section 19(1) of The Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 observed that *"though it is not necessary for the arrested person to be supplied with all the material that is forwarded to the Adjudicating Authority under Section 19(2), he/she has a constitutional and statutory right to be 'informed' of the grounds of arrest, which are compulsorily recorded in writing by the authorized officer in keeping with the mandate of Section 19(1) of the Act of 2002"*.

34. The Hon'ble Apex Court further regarding **format of the grounds of arrest** observed that "*the format prescribed under Rule 6 of Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (the Forms and the Manner*

of Forwarding a Copy of Arrest of a Person Along with the Material to the Adjudicating Authority and its Period of Retention) Rules, 2005 titled "Forms of Records", that this Form would be followed under Prevention of Money Laundering Act".

35. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Pankaj Bansal's** case, at para 42 observed that "*the arrested person as a matter of course without exception entitled to a copy of grounds of arrest*". The Hon'ble Apex Court in para 45 held that "*to give true meaning and purpose to the constitutional and the statutory mandate of Section 19(1) of the Act of 2002 of informing the arrested person of the grounds of arrest, we hold that it would be necessary, henceforth, that a copy of such written grounds of arrest is furnished to the arrested person as a matter of course and without exception*".

36. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Prabir Purkayastha's** case held that "*there is no significant difference in the language employed in Section 19(1) of the PMLA and Section 43B (1) of the UAPA regarding 'inform him of the grounds for such arrest made by this Court in the case of Pankaj Bansal be applied to the accused arrested under the provisions of UAP Act also. The requirement to communicate the grounds of arrest*

is the same in both the statutes. As a matter of fact, both the provisions find their source in the constitutional safeguard provided under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India. Hence, applying the golden rules of interpretation, the provisions which lay down a very important constitutional safeguard to a person arrested on charges of committing an offence either under the PMLA or under UAPA, have to be uniformly construed and applied and informing the arrested person the grounds of arrest in writing has to be applied pari passu to a person arrested in a case registered under the provisions of UAPA also in view of the mandate laid down in Pankaj Bansal's case. The purpose of informing to the arrested person the grounds of arrest is statutory and sacrosanct in as much as, this information would be the only effective means for the arrested person to consult his Advocate: oppose the police custody remand and to seek bail. Any other interpretation would tantamount to diluting the sanctity of the fundamental right guaranteed under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India".

37. The Hon'ble Apex Court in Prabir Purkayastha's case at para 22 observed that "*the right to be informed about the grounds of arrest flows from Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and any infringement of this fundamental right would vitiate the process of arrest and remand. Mere*

fact that a charge sheet has been filed in the matter, would not validate the illegality and the unconstitutionality committed at the time of arresting the accused and the grant of initial police custody remand to the accused".

38. The learned Advocate General also argued that the right to be informed about the grounds of arrest flows from Article 22 and any infirmity would vitiate the process of arrest and remand. But he argued that the three judges' bench of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Vijay Madanlal Choudhary and others Vs. Union of India and others**, observed that rigor of law U/s.19 of the PML Act, 2002 and section 43 B (1) of the UAP Act are different from section 41 Cr.P.C. regarding the power of police to arrest. However, the police arresting any person for the offence punishable under IPC or BNS, 2023 must comply with the mandate under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and comply section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023. There is no exception to anyone.

39. Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India mandates that "*no person who is arrested shall be detained in custody without being informed, as soon as may be, of the grounds for such arrest nor shall he be denied*

the right to consult, and to be defended by, a legal practitioner of his choice".

40. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Madhu Limaye, Pankaj Bansal, Prabir Purkayastha** and **Vijay Madanlal Choudhary** held that right to be 'informed' on the grounds of arrest under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India has no exception. If it is violated it would vitiate the whole process of arrest as well remand. The arrestee shall be released forthwith. It was further observed that mere fact that a charge sheet has been filed in the matter also would not valid the irregularity, and the unconstitutionality committed at the time of arresting the accused and remand. ***Therefore, undoubtedly, it shall be complied with when a person arrested under the provisions of IPC or any other law without any exceptions***.

41. Section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023 corresponding to section 50(2) Cr.P.C. 1973, mandates that "*every Police Officer or every person arresting any person without warrant, shall forthwith communicate to him the full particulars of the offence, for which he is arrested, or the other grounds of such arrest*". Therefore, section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023 find its source in the constitutional safeguard provided under Article 22(1) of the

Constitution of India. ***Hence, the provisions U/s.47(1) of BNSS, 2023 lay down a very important constitutional safeguard to a person arrested on charges of committing offence under IPC or BNS, 2023***.

42. Having said so, a question may arise, in what format the grounds of arrest should be, and about its content. As already discussed above, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Pankaj Bansal's** case, considered about format relating to grounds of arrest with reference to section 19 of The Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 and observed that 'rules under the said Act' provide a format, which has been followed by some of the Authorized Officers in the country in Prevention of Money Laundering Act cases.

43. Therefore, now the question is what the procedure in vogue in Andhra Pradesh is when police arrested a person U/s.41 Cr.P.C. for the offence under IPC or BNS or any other Act. The learned Advocate General contended that in the State of Andhra Pradesh some officers are communicating the grounds of arrest in writing, in their own form, furnishing basic case details leading to arrest of accused as 'grounds of arrest. Whereas some officers orally intimating the grounds of arrest. Therefore, it appears that there is no uniform practice.

44. As discussed above, the Hon'ble Apex Court in Pankaj Bansal's case, with reference to section 19(1) of The Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 and Article 22 of the Constitution of India observed that "**grounds of arrest be communicated in writing**". The Hon'ble Apex Court in Prabir Purkayastha's case explained the difference between the '**reasons for arrest**' and '**grounds of arrest**', stating that the grounds of arrest may convey to the arrested accused all basic facts, on which he was being arrested to provide him an opportunity of defending himself against the custodial remand and to seek bail. Thus, the grounds of arrest would invariably be personal to the accused and cannot be equated with the 'reasons of arrest', which are general in nature.

45. Therefore, to comply mandate of Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023 in its sprit, I am of the considered opinion that the ***grounds of arrest must be informed in writing conveying the basic facts, on which the accused was arrested to provide him an opportunity of defending himself against the custodial remand and to seek bail***.

46. Otherwise, it would boil down to the word of the police officer against the word of the accused. It would be difficult to find what is the truth of the facts disputed. The learned Senior Counsel for petitioner during arguments supplied a copy of A.P. Police Investigation Manual Part-I, Volume-IIA, which deals with arrest, custody, bail and remand, amended as per Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2009 dated 07.01.2009 with effect from 31.12.2009. This document says that the arrested persons have certain rights which the Police Officer should be familiar with. Thus, it is important from a human rights angle also besides statutory provisions and should be respected. One among the said rights is right to be informed of grounds of arrest. The above rules also speak that the person to be arrested, whether with or without warrant, should be informed of grounds for making the arrest but it does not prescribe any format of the grounds of arrest and details to be mentioned in the grounds of arrest. *Therefore, in the event of this fact being disputed in a given case, the burden will be on the Investigation Agency to establish that the grounds of arrest were informed to the accused person*.

47. Therefore, considering all the above aspects and issues in implementation of Constitutional and Statutory mandate, **I direct the Director General of Police in the State of Andhra Pradesh to take**

necessary steps forthwith prescribing a uniform 'format' for communicating grounds of arrest in writing, to the person arrested, which shall include all basic facts of the case leading to the arrest so as to enable him to defend himself to oppose the custodial remand and also to seek bail. Further, a copy of such grounds of arrest as communicated to the arrested person shall be enclosed along with the remand report, when filed before the Magistrate for seeking remand.

48. This Court in the case of **Jitteboina Guravaiah and another Vs. Officer on Special Duty, Anti-Naxalite Squad, Kothagudem and others**[10], issued certain directions to the Magistrates in the State to achieve the object to directives issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **D.K.Basu Vs. State of West Bengal**[11], that as soon as the arrestee is produced before the concerned Judicial Magistrate, such Judicial Magistrate shall be entitled to verify and satisfy himself/herself that arresting authority shall take all steps as indicated by the Supreme Court in directive numbers 2, 3 and 4 of the judgment in D.K.Basu's case, which relates to informing a friend or relative of the arrestee

[10] **1999 (3) ALT 672**

[11] **1997 (1) SCC 416**

mentioning the time, place of arrest and venue of the custody of the arrestee etc. This Court further directed the Magistrate to seek such other information from the arresting authority for satisfying himself/herself as to whether the arresting authorities have complied with requirements indicated and directive numbers 5, 6 and 7 of the judgment in D.K.Basu's case, and held that the concerned Judicial Magistrate in his order of remand record about the compliance or otherwise of the requirements as indicated above by the arresting authorities and pass appropriate order.

49. In the light of judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Pankaj Bansal and Prabir Purkayastha, ***this Court directs all the Magistrates/Judges in the District Judiciary, who are exercising power of remand in the State of Andhra Pradesh, shall record about their satisfaction of compliance or otherwise of the requirement, mandated under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and Section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023 without fail, in addition to the directives of this Court in Jitteboina Guravaiah and another Vs. Officer on Special Duty, Anti-Naxalite Squad, Kothagudem and others case***.

50. On the question about the meaning and connotation of '***as soon as may be***' found in Article 22 of the Constitution of India, the learned Advocate General submitted that the Hon'ble Apex Court in a recent judgment in the case of **Ram Kishore Arora Vs. Directorate of Enforcement**, held that "*performance of said duty must meet the "as soon as may be" must be performed at the outermost within 24 hours of the arrest, which would also be complained with Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India*".

51. When coming to the facts of the present case, the contention of the petitioner is that he was not informed of grounds of arrest as mandated by Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and Section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023. The contention of the 1st respondent/police is that they communicated the grounds of arrest to the petitioner on 20.09.2024 before producing him III Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate at Dehradun.

52. The petitioner filed a copy of remand report (Annexure-27 of the petition) submitted by the prosecution on 23.09.2024 to the learned IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada. He also filed a copy of objections (Annexure-28 of the petition) filed before the learned

Magistrate opposing the remand. The remand order under challenge is also filed as Annexure-1 to the petition.

53. Perusal of the copy of remand report would show that at page No.5 of the said remand report, in the last para, it is mentioned that *"during the course of investigation of A-1: Kukkala Vidya Sagar was arrested on 20.09.2024 at 06.30 hrs, near Tree of Life Resort, Bharathwala, Bisht Gaon, Rajpur in Dehradun, Uttarakhand by Sri U.Paparao, SI of Police, Ibrahimpatnam Police Station by furnishing the arrest intimation to Accused/A1 Sri Kukkala Venkata Rama Vidya Sagar and also furnishing arrest intimation to Sri N.Bhanu Prasad, S/o.Vasu….."*

54. The list of documents mentioned at page No.8 of the remand report, refers arrest memo of A-1 as item No.12. Item No.13 of the list documents relate to the arrest intimation of the accused. These facts are vital to decide whether the respondent/police complied with the mandate under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and Section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023 as claimed.

55. The 1st respondent/police along with their counter filed a copy of transit remand order (Annexure-6 of the counter) dated 20.09.2024

passed by the learned III Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dehradun. They also filed a copy of arrest intimation (Annexure-3 of the counter) furnished to the accused on 20.09.2024 and a copy of arrest intimation (Annexure-4 of the counter) to the family members through WhatsApp. The 1st respondent also filed a copy of Arrest/Court Surrender Form (Annexure-2 of the counter) produced before the learned III Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate at Dehradun. Police also filed a copy of arrest intimation to the family member, friend, person nominated by the arrestee U/s.36(b) of BNSS, 2023 dated 20.09.2024.

56. The petitioner/accused seriously disputed the copy of arrest intimation produced by the 1st respondent/police before this Court, styled as arrest intimation U/s.47(1) of BNSS to the person arrested. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner vehemently contended that it was not there in the records, when the accused was produced before the learned IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada and that there is no reference about it in the list of documents.

57. The copy of Arrest/Court Surrender Form produced at the time of transit remand on 20-09-2024 at Dehradun, is not under dispute. It contains the signature of the accused, Investigation Officer as well as

the signature of the learned III Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate at Dehradun, dated 20.09.2024. Perusal of the said document, column No.8 is as under:

> "*The arrested person, after being informed of the grounds of arrest and his legal rights, was duly Taken into custody on 20.09.2024 at 06.30 hours at Bisht Gaon, Dehradun. The following article(s) Was/were found on physical search, conducted on the person of the arrested person and was/were Taken into possession, for which at receipt was given to the arrested person. If no article found, 'NIL' may be indicated*".

58. The learned Advocate General fervently argued that as per column No.8, the petitioner was informed of grounds of arrest and his legal rights on 20.09.2024 at 06.30 a.m. at the time of arrest, and the same supported by copy of arrest intimation produced by the 1st respondent/police. It would show that the petitioner was informed of the grounds of arrest by furnishing basic fats relating to case number, sections of law, complainant details etc., and that he would be produced before the IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada, which would enable him to oppose his remand before the jurisdictional Magistrate at Vijayawada. His cousin Sri N. Bhanu Prasad was also informed about

the arrest of the petitioner on 20.09.2024. It also contained the signature of the accused.

59. The learned Advocate General strenuously argued that arrest intimation contained the signature of the accused, and it also establishes that a copy of FIR was also enclosed to the arrest intimation to know basic facts of the case which lead to his arrest.

60. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner vehemently argued that the petitioner filed reply to the counter filed by the 1st respondent, contending that the column No.8 of the Arrest/Court Surrender Form signed by the accused, is not sufficient compliance and it would not cure the defect of non-supplying the grounds of arrest to the accused; and further, the petitioner while in custody was coerced to sign documents of the officers of the 1st respondent; In those circumstances, for reasons best known to the 1st respondent/police, arrest intimation came to be filed before this Court for the first time to wriggle out from the non-compliance.

61. I already mentioned about the copy of transit remand order passed by the learned III Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate at Dehradun. Undisputedly, it contained the signature of the petitioner indicating that

copy was provided to the petitioner. Further, Arrest/Court Surrender Form contained signature of the petitioner, Investigation Officer, as well as learned III Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate at Dehradun. Column No.8 referred above, would indicate that the petitioner was informed of the grounds of arrest and his legal rights.

62. Therefore, the next factual question is "*whether the petitioner was actually informed of the grounds of arrest*?"

63. The arrest intimation discussed supra contains details about the case, sections of law, complainant in the case. It also shows that the copy of FIR was enclosed to the said arrest intimation prepared U/s.47(1) of BNSS, 2023. Therefore, all the basic details of case which lead to the arrest were available enabling the arrested person to oppose remand before the Magistrate at Vijayawada.

64. I stated supra about the copy of remand report produced before the learned IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada, and its contents. Its contents establish that the Arresting Officer furnished arrest intimation to accused i.e., petitioner on 20.09.2024 at 06.30 hours. I have no hesitation to say it is nothing but the arrest intimation card was produced before this Court. It appears that same was referred as arrest

memo instead of arrest intimation, at item No.12 in the list of documents, mentioned in the remand report. Undisputedly item No.13 pertains to the arrest intimation to the cousin of the petitioner as required U/s.36(b) of BNSS, 2023.

65. Admittedly, the counsel for petitioner before the Magistrate, filed detailed objections running 100 pages opposing remand on 23.09.202. Therefore, as rightly contended by the learned Advocate General, since the petitioner was informed of the grounds of arrest on 20.09.2024 as mentioned at column No.8 of the Arrest/Court Surrender Form also received a copy of ground of arrest as required U/s.47(1) of BNSS, 2023 in the form of arrest intimation (Annexure-4 of the counter) enclosed with copy of FIR, the petitioner on 23.09.2024 could well oppose the remand by filing detailed objections running around 100 pages which would at least take 2 or 3 days to prepare, and filed bail petition before the learned Magistrate.

66. It is true that the learned IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada, in his remand order under challenge, did not mention in specific words that the mandate under the Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India was complied with by providing grounds of arrest to

the accused, but clearly mentioned that *"the next objection raised by the learned counsel for accused is that accused is not supplied the arrest card. On this aspect, police submitted that they have obtained the signature of accused on arrest intimation to Family Member / Friend / Person Nominated by arrestee U/s.36(b) of BNSS, 2023"*.

67. The learned Magistrate finally observed that "*I have perused the said memorandum annexed to the remand report*", and finally learned Magistrate observed that "*police have complied with the mandatory provision as contemplated under law*". Therefore, the learned Magistrate mentioned about the objection of the learned counsel for petitioner about the arrest card, which is nothing but arrest intimation, containing the signature of the petitioner.

68. The petitioner in the quash petition did not mention that when he was in the custody of 1st respondent/police, he was coerced to sign documents as directed by the Police Officer of the 1st respondent. But, in reply to the counter filed on behalf of the 1st respondent, first time, came with a version that he was coerced to sign on documents when he was in custody. The remand order of the learned Magistrate at Dehradun or Vijayawada, does not disclose that any such statement was made by the

petitioner before the learned Magistrates. The remand order of the learned Magistrate at Vijayawada, would show that he questioned the petitioner about the ill-treatment in the hands of police, when he was in their custody, and the petitioner did not complain any such ill-treatment.

69. In those circumstances, the contention of the petitioner that he was coerced to sign on the documents filed before this Court will not carry any weight, to opine that the contention of the police about the arrest intimation is an afterthought. Therefore, I have no hesitation to hold that the 1st respondent/police have complied with the mandate under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India and Section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023, on the date of arrest i.e., 20.09.2024 at the time of arrest of the petitioner. Hence, viewing from any angle, it is not tenable on appreciation of the above facts and it shall be rejected. In such circumstances and in view of the facts of the case, I do not find any grounds to quash the remand order dated 23.09.2024 passed by the learned IV Addl.Chief Judicial Magistrate, Vijayawada, on the ground of non-compliance of mandate under Article 22(1) of the Constitution of India or Section 47(1) of BNSS, 2023. Accordingly, the point is answered.

70. I would like to make it clear that none of the above observations on facts shall be construed as a comment on the merits of the case.

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

72. **The Registrar General is directed to take necessary steps forthwith to circulate a copy of this Order to all the Magistrates/Judges in the District Judiciary in the State of Andhra Pradesh, and Director General of Police, Andhra Pradesh State at Mangalagiri**.

As a sequel, interlocutory applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE B.V.L.N. CHAKRAVARTHI

L.R. Copy is to be marked.
B/o. psk.

28.10.2024

psk

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B.V.L.N. CHAKRAVARTHI

01

CRIMINAL PETITION No.6807 OF 2024

Note: Mark L.R. copy
psk

28th October, 2024

W
psk