



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

[3521]

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 9493/2026

Between:

POTHURAJU PRASAD, S/O. POTHURAJU GURAVAI AH AGED ABOUT
45 YEARS, OCC COOLIE, R/O. NUNEVARI PALLI VILLAGE,
RAJAMPET TOWN, RAJAMPET MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT-516115.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,
VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI. GUNTUR DISTRICT-522237.
2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, KADAPA RURAL, YSR
KADAPA DISTRICT- 516001.
3. THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, KADAPA RURAL,
YSR KADAPA DISTRICT- 516001.
4. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, PENDLI MARRI POLICE STATION,
PENDLI MARRI, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT- 516216.
5. SRI BOREDDY GANGI REDDY, S/O. BOREDDY LAKSHUMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS, OCC BUSINESS, R/O. GANGANAPALLI
VILLAGE AND POST, PENDLI MARRI MANDAL, YSR KADAPA
DISTRICT-516216.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.MAHESWARI ARIKA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.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 order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the the action of the Respondents 2 AND 3 in not taking any action against the Respondent No 4 and his subordinate staff who are interfering in Money dispute/civil dispute between the petitioner and 5th Respondent and his henchmen in connection with Money bonds is illegal arbitrary unconstitutional and violative of article 14 and 21 of The Constitution of India and consequently direct Respondent No 4 and his subordinate staff not to interfere in Money dispute/civil dispute between the petitioner and 5TH Respondent and his henchmen in in connection with Money bonds and to pass....”

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

3. Ms. Maheswari Arika, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that respondent Nos. 2 and 3 are not taking any action against respondent No.4 and his subordinate staff, who are interfering in the money/civil disputes pending between the petitioner and respondent No. 5.

4. Sri P. Ajay Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader, on written instructions, submits that the allegations of the petitioner are vague and that there is no reliable evidence. The Station House Officer has stated that the matter is civil in nature and the parties were advised to approach the

appropriate Court. The grievance of the petitioner is that, at the behest of respondent No.5, respondent No.4 has been interfering in the civil disputes and subjecting the petitioner to pressure and coercion to clear the alleged debt, otherwise he would do away with the life of the petitioner. The petitioner has submitted a representation on 23.03.2026 to respondent No.2/the Superintendent of Police, but it appears that respondent No.2 has not taken any action on the same.

5. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, and recording the submissions of the learned Assistant Government Pleader, the Writ Petition is disposed of, directing the respondent No. 2 to dispose of the representation of the petitioner dated 23.03.2026 in accordance with law within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of this order, and to submit the same to the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Range, as to what action was taken against respondent No. 4, as he allegedly interfered in the civil disputes pending between the petitioner and respondent No.5.

6. With the above observations and directions, 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: 23.04.2026

RSI

100

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 9493 of 2026

Date:23.04.2026
RSI