

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

Criminal Appeal No(s). 457/2012

GUDIPALLI SIDDHARTHA REDDY

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

STATE C.B.I.

Respondent(s)

[TOP OF THE BOARD]

WITH CrI.A. No. 894-895/2012

Date : 20-08-2025 These appeals were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

For Appellant(s) :

in CrI.A.

No.457/2012

Mr. S. Nagamuthu, Sr. Adv.

Mr. P.Venkat Reddy, Adv.

Mr. P.Srinivas Reddy, Adv.

Mr. G. N. Reddy, AOR

in CrI.Appeal

Nos.894-895/2012

Mr. M Gireesh Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Ankur S. Kulkarni, AOR

Mr. Sanjay Singh, Adv.

Mr. Varun Kanval, Adv.

Mr. Tarun, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

No.1-CBI

Mr. Sachin Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR

Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Amit Sharma-b, Adv.

Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AOR

For Res.No.2

In CrI.Appeal

Nos.894-895/2012

Mr. L. Narasimha Reddy, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Prasanth Kumar Tyagi, Adv.

Mr. Shreyas Kaushal, Adv.

Mr. G. N. Reddy, AOR

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

1. During the course of arguments, it was pointed out by the learned counsel for appellant in Criminal Appeal Nos.894-895 of 2012 that as is evident from Paragraph No. 36 of the Trial Court judgment, as per Memo filed on 16th December, 2002, one copy of the report by the Centre for DNA Fingerprinting and Diagnostics (CDFD) was submitted to the High Court and one copy was given to the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI). However, the same was not produced in evidence by the prosecution, opining the same to be irrelevant.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant further submitted that in the counter affidavit filed by the present appellant in Criminal R.C.No.2055 of 2004 before the High Court the stand taken by the CBI was that the report was not found to be relevant, therefore, was not produced in evidence.

3. Let the respondent-CBI produce copy of the report from CDFD before this Court.

4. It has also come on record that initially post-mortem of the deceased was conducted by Dr.B.Muni Swamy. The report dated 25th February, 2002, is on record. The final opinion expressed in the postmortem report was that the death of the deceased was caused due to strangulation. There were number of injuries found on

the body of the deceased, which were found to be anti-mortem.

5. However, Dr. Muni Swamy was not examined during the course of the trial. The reason therefor be also explained by the respondent-CBI.

6. List on 3rd September, 2025.

(ANITA MALHOTRA)
AR-CUM-PS

(AKSHAY KUMAR BHORIA)
COURT MASTER