

P.V. Ramana Reddy v. Union of India & Ors.; connected matters separately listed

Case number: SLP (Crl.) No. 4430 of 2019; connected Diary No. 15477/2019 and SLP (Crl.) Nos. 4322-4324, 4571 and 4546 of 2019

Citation: Order dated 27 May 2019; no neutral or reporter citation independently verified

Decision date: 2019-05-27

Historical GST-arrest litigation: precise refusal of special leave, not a reasoned Supreme Court bail prohibition

Court: Supreme Court

Bench: Ranjan Gogoi, CJI, and Aniruddha Bose, J. (vacation bench; ROP identifies the first member as Chief Justice)

Decision stage: Non-speaking refusal of special leave in the lead SLP; connected matters listed for another date

01 Facts

The petitioner sought special leave against the Telangana High Court's judgment dated 18 April 2019 in W.P. No. 4764/2019. The ROP also listed several connected proceedings. It gives no account of the alleged transactions, arrest material, tax quantum or parties' detailed legal arguments. The scope of this note is the Supreme Court's procedural disposition; the underlying High Court reasons are not reproduced as if they were reasons given in this ROP.

Pinpoint: Official PDF page 1, caption; page 2, operative headings.

02 Court Discussion

After hearing counsel and considering the material, the Court declined interference in SLP (Crl.) No. 4430/2019. It supplied no substantive reasons and did not grant leave. The dismissal must therefore be described as that refusal, not as a fresh reasoned Supreme Court ruling adopting every proposition in the High Court judgment. Later anticipatory-bail analysis must account for Radhika Agarwal, paragraph 70: a fact-supported reasonable apprehension of arrest can support an application even before an FIR. Footnote 56 names Choodamani and Bharat Bhushan as contrary GST authorities; it does not name this short Ramana dismissal. This note neither derives an absolute bail bar from the dismissal nor labels the entire High Court judgment overruled by that footnote.

Pinpoint: 2019 ROP page 2, unnumbered operative text; Radhika Agarwal (27 February 2025), paragraph 70 and footnote 56, principal opinion/composite PDF page 58.

03 Decision

SLP (Crl.) No. 4430/2019 was dismissed and its pending interlocutory applications, if any, were disposed of. Under a separate heading, Diary No. 15477/2019 and SLP (Crl.) Nos. 4322-4324/2019, 4571/2019 and

4546/2019 were directed to be listed on 29 May 2019. Those connected matters were not dismissed by this order.

Pinpoint: Official PDF page 2, separate operative headings.

04 In Favour Of

Respondents on non-interference in SLP 4430/2019 only; connected matters merely listed

The petitioner in SLP 4430/2019 did not obtain Supreme Court interference. This is a narrow procedural outcome; it is not a finding of tax evasion or criminal guilt, and does not determine the connected petitions listed for a later date.

Pinpoint: Official PDF page 2.

05 AKHB REVIEW POINT

AKHB REVIEW POINT: Cite the exact SLP number, date and non-speaking nature of the dismissal. Do not use a composite caption to assign the lead case's result to every connected case. Keep the later Sapna Jain notice/reference order and Radhika merits clarification distinct. For a live request for protection, examine the later governing law and specific arrest-apprehension facts rather than treating this 2019 refusal as a universal rule against anticipatory bail.

Pinpoint: AKHB analysis based on the complete ROP and the identified later Radhika passage.

Sources and limitations

Relevant provisions

Special-leave procedure; the ROP does not interpret a substantive GST or criminal-procedure section

Later anticipatory-bail clarification: Radhika Agarwal, 2025 INSC 272, paragraph 70 and footnote 56

Statutory note

No section-by-section GST arrest or bail reasoning appears in this ROP. The note does not certify the correctness of every underlying High Court proposition, current statutory text or any person's current custody/protection status.

Treatment note

Limited later-law check: the official Radhika Agarwal judgment, paragraph 70 and footnote 56, was read and visually verified. It permits consideration of fact-supported anticipatory bail without a prior FIR and identifies Choodamani/Bharat Bhushan as contrary GST authorities; the footnote is not described as expressly overruling this non-speaking SLP dismissal. The 29 May 2019 Sapna ROP separately records the subsequent listing/reference directions. No comprehensive later docket, review or treatment audit has been completed as at 12 October 2026. This AI-assisted AKHB research note is based on identified primary material. It does not evidence human legal review and is not a substitute for professional advice on the facts of a particular case.

Scope of source review

Complete two-page official ROP read and both operative groups checked. Party, underlying High Court case, SLP number, date and vacation-bench composition verified. The Chief Justice is named as Ranjan Gogoi using the official biography/listing already checked for the contemporaneous Sapna ROP. One dated Supreme Court document is counted; the underlying High Court judgment is not counted as a Supreme Court merits decision, and the connected cases are not multiplied into additional decisions.

Primary source

Source description: Supreme Court of India official record of proceedings dated 27 May 2019

Official source: [Open source document](#)

AKHB source PDF: [Open source document](#)

Judges: Ranjan Gogoi; Aniruddha Bose

Outcome type: procedural

Additional sources

Entry 1

Source: Radhika Agarwal, official judgment of 27 February 2025

Source document: [Open source document](#)

Pinpoint: Paragraph 70 and footnote 56, page 58

Entry 2

Source: Sapna Jain and connected matters, official ROP of 29 May 2019

Source document: [Open source document](#)

Pinpoint: Pages 2-3, later separate dispositions

Entry 3

Source: Supreme Court biography of Justice Ranjan Gogoi

Source document: [Open source document](#)

Pinpoint: CJI appointment on 3 October 2018

Disclosures and source rights

AI disclosure: Prepared with AI assistance from the identified sources. No human legal review is claimed.

General disclaimer: For professional information only; not legal advice. Read the judgment and applicable law in full and obtain case-specific advice before acting.

©AKHB & Associates. This copyright notice applies to the original AKBH research note, analysis and presentation. It does not assert ownership of the judicial orders, judgments, legislation, circulars or other third-party source material. Rights in those sources remain with their respective rights holders, as applicable.