



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

[3521]

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

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 4093/2026

Between:

1. LINGALA KIRAN KUMAR, S/O SUBBARAO, AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS, OCCUPATION. PROPRIETOR - AKANKSHA HAIR AND BEAUTY AND FRANCHISEE - MANEA LUXE INTERNATIONAL SALON, R/O SAI SAUDA APARTMENT, FLAT NO.403, JAMMI CHETTU CENTRE, MOGALRAJAPURAM, VIJAYAWADA, NTR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI.-522237
2. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, ANDHRA PRADESH, MANGALAGIRI.-522503
3. THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, VIJAYAWADA CITY, NTR DISTRICT.-520001
4. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, CENTRAL DIVISION, VIJAYAWADA CITY.-520008
5. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, MACHAVARAM POLICE STATION, VIJAYAWADA CITY.-522435
6. SRI P CHANDRASEKHAR, CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, TASK FORCE, VIJAYAWADA CITY.-520008

7.KADIYALA SITA RAMASWAMY, S/O VENKAT, AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS, R/O D.NO.59-11-1, GAYATHRI NAGAR, KADIYALA VENKAYYA VEEDHI, VIJAYAWADA.-520008

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.V R MAHESWARA RAO PALETI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The Writ Petition has been filed for the following relief:

“...to issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, declaring the action of the police authorities in forcibly entering the petitioner's salon premises, conducting illegal raids, threatening false implication, and interfering in a pending civil dispute as illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional and violative of Articles 14, 19(1)(g) and 21 of the Constitution of India consequently direct the Police authorities to forthwith desist from interfering with the petitioner's peaceful possession, lawful business operations and day-to-day functioning of the salon situated in the schedule premises, except strictly in accordance with law...”

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

3. Sri P.V.R.Maheswara Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that that the petitioner, as a tenant, has invested nearly one crore rupees in establishing a salon under the Manea Luxe franchisee. However, respondent No.7, being the landlord, with an intention to set up a similar salon under the same franchise, has approached respondent Nos.3 to 6 (police officials), who have allegedly been entering the petitioner's premises without authority and threatening to implicate him in criminal proceedings, thereby interfering in the civil dispute pending between the petitioner and respondent No.7. It is stated that the petitioner has already instituted O.S.No.1911 of 2025 before the learned Principal Civil Judge (Junior Division), Vijayawada, seeking a decree of permanent injunction against respondent No.7, and orders therein are awaited.

4. *Per contra*, Sri P.Ajay Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader, on written instructions, submits that respondent No.7 lodged a report on 01.12.2025, which was registered as F.I.R.No.424 of 2025 of Machavaram Police Station, N.T.R District, for offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), and 351(2) read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (for brevity, 'the BNS'). After investigation, a charge sheet has been filed against the petitioner. It is further submitted that no police personnel have entered the petitioner's premises illegally, nor they compelled or threatened the petitioner to compromise the matter with respondent No.7.

5. Be that as it may, the petitioner, by way of affidavit, reiterates that he has invested nearly one crore rupees for obtaining the franchisee license of Manea Luxe and for running the salon. He alleges that respondent No.7 has sought the intervention of respondent Nos.3 to 6 to exert pressure upon him in relation to the civil dispute.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Writ Petition is disposed of directing the respondent Nos.3 to 6 not to further enter into the premises of the petitioner or interfere with the petitioner's business operations, and not to intervene in the civil dispute pending between the petitioner and respondent No.7.

7. Accordingly, 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: 16.02.2026
PRA

170

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 4093 of 2026

Date: 16.02.2026
PRA