

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Cr1.) No(s). 18853/2025

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 19-11-2025 in CRP No. 9363/2025 passed by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amravati]

BALAJI GOVINDAPPA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 301207/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

WITH

SLP(Cr1) No. 18836/2025 (II)

(IA No. 300768/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(Cr1) No. 18840/2025 (II)

(IA No. 300841/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Date : 21-01-2026 These matters were 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. C.A. Sundram, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Dhinoja Pruthvi Yogesh, AOR
Mr. Zafar Inayat, Adv.
Ms. Rohini Musa, Adv.
Mr. Abhishek Gupta, Adv.

Mr. S. Niranjan Reddy, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Siddhartha Dave, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Mahfooz Ahsan Nazki, AOR
Mr. Uday S. Bhanu, Adv.
Ms. Alekhya Shastry, Adv.
Mr. Pradyuman Kasitha, Adv.
Mr. Vivek Rajan D.B., Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Siddharth Aggarwal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Guntur Pramod Kumar, AOR
Ms. Prerna Singh, Adv.
Mr. Samarth Krishan Luthra, Adv.
Mr. Vishwajeet Singh, Adv.
Ms. Rajni Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Dhruv Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Karl P Rustomkhan, Adv.
Mr. Parv Arora, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. We have heard learned senior counsel on behalf of the petitioners as well as Mr. Mukul Rohatgi and Mr. Sidharth Luthra, learned senior counsel on behalf of the State of Andhra Pradesh at considerable length.

2. In the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case, we are not inclined to interfere with the impugned order(s) dated 19.11.2025 passed by the Andhra Pradesh High Court. The Special Leave Petitions are, accordingly, dismissed.

3. However, the interim protection granted by this Court vide order dated 26.11.2025 shall continue to operate, meanwhile enabling the petitioners to seek regular bail before the trial court on merits. In the event any adverse order is passed in the regular bail application, it is clarified that the interim protection granted by this Court shall continue to operate for a period of two weeks from the date the order that may be passed to enable the petitioners to approach the High Court.

4. In the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, we expect that the High Court will allow the interim protection to continue till it takes a final view on the regular bail application.

5. It is clarified that we have not expressed any opinion on the

prayer made by the petitioners for the grant of regular bail. Such an application shall be decided by the Court concerned as per its own merits.

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

(NITIN TALREJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI T.C.)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR