



**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: 10766/2026

Between:

PULI VENKATA LAKSHMI PRASAD,, S/O. VENKATA RATNAM, AGED
55 YEARS, R/O. 3-93, CHOLLAVEEDU RACHARLA MANDAL,
PRAKASAM DISTRICT-523372. NOW RESIDING AT MANGALAGIRI,
GUNTUR DISTRICT-522503.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,
VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI-522238.
2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, PALNADU DISTRICT- 522601.
3. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, NARASARAOPET RURAL POLICE
STATION PALNADU DISTRICT-522601.
4. INJETI SADHASIVA REDDY, S/O. SIVA KUMAR REDDY, AGED
ABOUT 53 YEARS, OCC ZOLLOGY LECTURE IN SS AND N
COLLEGE, R/O. FLAT NO. 102, VYSHNAVI TOWERS, PALNADU
ROAD BESIDE SUZUKI SHOW ROOM, NARASARAOPET,
PALNADU DISTRICT- 522601.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

RAMAKRISHNA AKURATHI

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 an appropriate writ or order or a direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus direct the 3rd respondent not to interfere in civil dispute and not to make any threatening calls to the petitioner and summon him to appear before the 3rd respondent authority which is illegal arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and also violative of principles of natural justice consequently direct the 3rd respondent not to interfere in Civil dispute and not to summon the petitioner and pass”

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader.
3. The District Superintendent of Police and respondent No.3 are present.
4. Sri Akurathi Rama Krishna, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner was called to the police station by respondent No.3 at the behest of respondent No.2 on a PGRS complaint submitted by respondent No.4 and exerted some undue influence on the petitioner for settlement of the civil dispute.
5. The District Superintendent of Police, who is present before the Court along with respondent No.3, submits that on the PGRS complaint submitted by respondent No.4, respondent No.3, as per his instructions, called the petitioner and his son, as there was an element of criminal intimidation in the complaint lodged by respondent No.4. After verifying the complaint and also

the statements of respondent No.4 and the son of the petitioner, it was found that the PGRS complaint submitted by respondent No.4 is civil in nature. Therefore, the police authorities have not further interfered in the matter or called either the petitioner or his son. The preliminary enquiry also, while conversing with the petitioner and his son, was cordial.

6. Sri P. Ajay Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader, on written instructions, submits that as per statutory prescription under Section 173(3) of 'the BNSS', a preliminary enquiry was conducted by respondent No.3 and it was noticed that the averments of the PGRS complaint submitted by respondent No.4 are civil in nature. The police have never committed anything as alleged by the petitioner in his affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition.

7. Having regard to the entire facts and circumstances of the case, recording the submissions of the District Superintendent of Police and the learned Assistant Government Pleader, the Writ Petition is disposed of directing the respondent Nos.2 and 3 not to interfere henceforth in the civil disputes and not to make threatening calls to the petitioner or summon him to the police station without following due process of law. It is not out of place to mention that the respondent No.2, before endorsing any PGRS complaint to his subordinates, shall meticulously examine the averments of the complaint and forward the same to his subordinates only for conducting any preliminary enquiry. If the averments of the complaint disclose that *prima facie* the cause of action relates to a civil issue, respondent No.2 shall not endorse the same to his

subordinates for conducting any preliminary enquiry as contemplated under Section 173(3) of 'the BNSS'.

8. 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
RSI

99

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 10766 of 2026

Date: 30.04.2026
RSI