



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

[3521]

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

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 11620/2026

Between:

1. B RAMA KRISHNA REDDY, S/O. PADIGALA REDDY, AGED ABOUT
50 YEARS, OCC BUSINESS, R/O. H.NO. 25/259, LALITHA NAGAR,
NGOS COLONY, NANDYAL, NANDYAL DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE, NANDYAL TALUQ POLICE
STATION, NANDYAL, NANDYAL DISTRICT.

2. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,
VELDGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.

3. GANGAIAH, SUB-INSPECTOR OF POLICE, NANDYAL TALUQ
POLICE STATION, NANDYAL, NANDYAL DISTRICT.

4. BODANAM CHANDRA SHEKAR, S/O. BODANAM MUNA SWAMY,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS, R/O. H.NO. 26/371/G8, OPP RAILWAY
STATION, M.S. NAGAR, NANDYAL, NANDYAL DISTRICT

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P NAGENDRA REDDY

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 to declare the action of the Respondent No.1 in interfering with the civil dispute between the Petitioner and the Respondent No.4 without following due process of law and compelling the Petitioner to accept the illegal demand of the Respondent No.4 as arbitrary, illegal and in violation of Article 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondent No.1 not to interfere with the civil dispute between the Petitioner and the Respondent No.4 without following due process of law in the interest of justice and pass such other order(s)”

2. Heard the learned Counsel for the Petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home.

3. Sri P. Nagendra Reddy, learned Counsel for the Petitioner, submits that the Respondent No.1 is unlawfully interfering in a purely civil dispute between the Petitioner and Respondent No.4, without following due process of law, and is coercing the Petitioner to accept the illegal demands of Respondent No.4.

4. Sri P. Ajay Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home, on written instructions, submits that, based on the complaint lodged by Respondent No.4, the police called the Petitioner for the purpose of a preliminary inquiry, but did not interfere in the civil dispute pending between the Petitioner and Respondent No.4.

5. Having regard to the 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.1 not to interfere

henceforth in the civil dispute between the Petitioner and the Respondent No.4 without following due process of 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: 30.04.2026
KMS

127

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

Writ PETITION No.11620 of 2026

Date: 30.04.2026

KMS