



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2026
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CRIMINAL) NO. 3332 OF 2026)

MUPPIDI AVINASH REDDY

APPELLANT (S)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH

RESPONDENT (S)

O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. The appellant is aggrieved by the order dated 29.01.2026, whereby the Andhra Pradesh High Court has declined his prayer for anticipatory bail. The appellant sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.21/2024 dated 23.09.2024, registered with CID Police Station, Mangalagiri, for offences under Sections 409, 420, and 120B read with Sections 34 and 37 of the IPC and Sections 7, 7A, 8, 13(1)(b), and 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.
3. The allegations are that there were large-scale irregularities in the implementation of the excise policy and functioning of the Andhra Pradesh State Beverages Corporation Limited from 2019 to 2024. These irregularities included discrimination and manipulation of the allocation of Orders for Supply, giving preferential treatment to some brands at the cost of others. The entire episode has been captioned as the "*Andhra Pradesh Liquor Scam*".
4. The appellant is the brother of a co-accused, and the allegations against him are of generating and transferring the

kickbacks and other proceeds of the crime. In short, the appellant apparently fled the country, but before doing so, he claims to have been in regular touch with the Investigating Officer (IO). Thereafter, a Look Out Circular was issued against him. Apprehending his arrest at the airport, the appellant was unable to travel back to India and instead, approached the High Court for the grant of anticipatory bail, which was declined vide the impugned order.

5. When the matter came up for hearing on 24.02.2026, we declined to grant *interim* protection against arrest and directed the appellant to return to India and surrender before the IO, whereupon his prayer for regular bail would be considered in accordance with law.

6. In faithful compliance with the said order, the appellant returned to India and surrendered before the IO on 26.02.2026. He was initially remanded to judicial custody and during the hearing on 12.03.2026, it was pointed out that police custody of the appellant had been sought for the purpose of custodial interrogation. It is not in dispute that such permission was accorded, and the appellant has already been subjected to custodial interrogation.

7. Some of the co-accused of the appellant have also been granted bail, owing to the specific facts and circumstances of each case.

8. Taking into consideration the appellant's compliance with the *interim* direction of this Court, the fact that he has undertaken to abide by the law, and that he is willing to comply with all the terms and conditions that may be imposed

by the Trial Court, however, without expressing any opinion on merits of the case, we invoke our powers under Article 142 of the Constitution and instead of granting the relief of anticipatory bail, we mould the same for the grant of regular bail. Consequently, the appellant is directed to be released on regular bail during the pendency of the trial, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court. The Trial Court shall be at liberty to impose stringent conditions for the same, as it may deem appropriate.

9. It goes without saying that since the appellant has been released on bail by keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case, this order shall not be considered as a binding precedent for the purpose of the grant of bail in other matters.

10. The appeal stands disposed of, in the above terms.

.....CJI
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.
(JOYMALYA BAGCHI)

.....J.
(VIPUL M. PANCHOLI)

NEW DELHI;
MARCH 20, 2026.

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s).
3332/2026

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 29-01-2026
in CRLP No. 10012/2025 passed by the High Court of Andhra
Pradesh at Amravati]

MUPPIDI AVINASH REDDY

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 58910/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED
JUDGMENT)

Date : 20-03-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPUL M. PANCHOLI

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Siddharth Dave, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Goel, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Polanki Gowtham, Adv.
Mr. Tanisha Kaushal, Adv.
Mr. Snehasish Mukherjee, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Aggarwal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Guntur Pramod Kumar, AOR
Ms. Prerna Singh, Adv.
Mr. Vishwajeet Singh, Adv.
Mr. Karl P Rustomkhan, Adv.
Mr. Karan Dhalla, Adv.
Mr. Parv Arora, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Leave granted.

The appeal is disposed of in terms of the signed order.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand closed.

(NITIN TALREJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI T.C.)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(Signed order is placed on the file)