

ITEM NO.42

COURT NO.7

SECTION II

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CRIMINAL) Diary No.58657/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 09-10-2025 in IA No. 2/2025 passed by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amravati]

CHEVIREDDY BHASKAR REDDY

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 262328/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT & IA No. 262326/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION)

Date : 15-10-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. S. Niranjan Reddy, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Goel, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sahil Raveen, AOR
Mr. Uday, Adv.
Mr. Venkatesh B. Reddy, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Aggarwal, Sr, Adv.
Mr. Guntur Pramod Kumar, AOR
Ms. Prerna Singh, Adv.
Ms. Rajni Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Samarth Krishan Luthra, Adv.
Mr. Vishwajeet Singh, Adv.
Mr. Karl P. Rustom Khan, Adv.

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

1. Exemption Application is allowed.
2. Application seeking permission to file the Special Leave Petition is granted.
3. This petition arises from the order passed by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh dated 9-10-2025 below I.A. No.2/2025 filed in

Criminal Petition No.10331/2025 by which the High Court while considering the State's challenge to the grant of regular bail to another co-accused (Accused No.4) in connection with FIR No.21/2024, directed that the Special Judge for Trial of SPE & ACB cases-cum-III Additional District Judge, Vijayawada shall await the decision of the High Court before deciding the bail application preferred by the petitioner - herein including other bail applications filed by the co-accused persons.

4. Heard Mr. Niranjan Reddy, the learned Senior counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr. Sidharth Luthra and Mr. Siddharth Aggarwal, the learned Senior counsel appearing for the State of Andhra Pradesh.

5. At the outset, we may state that we are dismayed with the impugned order passed by the High Court. We do not approve of the same.

6. We are of the view that there was no good reason for the High Court to pass an order directing the Special Judge to wait till the High Court takes a call on the application by the State seeking cancellation of bail of the original accused No.4.

7. We order that the application filed by the State seeking cancellation of bail granted to Accused No.4 shall be heard on its own merits in accordance with the law and at the same time, the bail application filed by the petitioner - herein, arising from the very same FIR, shall also be heard at the earliest on its own merits in accordance with law.

8. Grant or refusal of bail has something to do with the personal liberty of the accused. Time and again, this Court has said that there should not be any delay in so far as hearing of the bail application is concerned. This is in tune with the spirit of Article 21 of the Constitution. The petitioner was not even before the High Court when the impugned order came to be passed.

9. It is needless to clarify that the petitioner - herein for the purpose of bail will have to make out his own case and in so far as the issue of cancellation of bail is concerned, the High Court will look into on its own. Both the applications shall be decided on

their own merits in accordance with law, without being influenced by any of the observations made by us or the High Court.

10. It is needless to clarify that all contentions for both the sides are kept open to be canvassed in accordance with law.

11. With the aforesaid, the Special Leave Petition stands disposed of.

12. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(VISHAL ANAND)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)