



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3521]

MONDAY, THE NINTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 3536/2026

Between:

GANTYADA ANIL KUMAR, S/O. GANTYADA KONDALA RAO, AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS, R/O. D.NO. 13-9-33/1, DANDU BAZAR ROAD, NEAR MVDM PRIMARY HIGH SCHOOL, MAHARANIPETA, VISAKHAPATNAM (URBAN), VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 530002.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI AMARAVATI, ANDHRA PRADESH. - 522238
2. THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, VISAKHAPATNAM CITY POLICE, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 530001.
3. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, ARILOVA POLICE STATION, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH. - 530040

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

JAYA PRAKASH MADASU

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following relief:-

“...to issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ order or direction Declaring the action of the respondents in repeatedly calling the petitioner and his family members to the Police Station threatening and harassing them without following due procedure under law as illegal arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and Consequently direct the respondents not to summon the petitioner or his family members to the Police Station except by following the procedure established under law and pass....”

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader.

3. Sri Jaya Prakash Madasu, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that respondent No.3 has been continuously calling the petitioner to the police station and subjecting him to harassment, which is violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

4. Sri P. Ajay Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader, on written instructions, submits that the wife of the petitioner approached respondent No.3 by lodging a complaint, based on which respondent No.3 called the petitioner to the police station. He further submits that counselling was conducted between the petitioner and his wife by respondent No.3, as the wife alleged that the petitioner has been maintaining an extra-marital

relationship with another woman, harassing her, and neglecting their eight-year-old girl child.

5. Considering the above submissions of the learned Assistant Government Pleader, this Writ Petition is disposed of directing respondent No.3 not to call further the petitioner to the police station unnecessarily or subject him to harassment without following due process of law. It is made clear that if the complaint lodged by the wife of the petitioner discloses the commission of a cognizable offence, respondent No.3 is at liberty to proceed in accordance with law.

6. In the result, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall stand closed.

DR. Y. LAKSHMANA RAO, J

Date: 09.02.2026
RSI

398

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 3536 of 2026

Date: 09.02.2026
RSI