



**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: 12008/2026

Between:

1. B V SUBBA REDDY,, S/O PAPI REDDY, AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
OCC. BUSINESS, R/O H NO 18-17, UMAMAHESWARI NAGAR,
SUDIREDDPALLE VILLAGE, KURNOOL TOWN AND MANDAL
KURNOOL DISTRICT, AP.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY HOME DEPARTMENT, A.P. SECRETARIAT
VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT. 522237

2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, NANDYAL DISTRICT, AT
NANDYAL, AP 518501

3. THE CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, NANDYAL III TOWN POLICE
STATION, NANDYAL, NANDYAL DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
518501

4. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE, NANDYAL III TOWN POLICE
STATION, NANDYAL, NANDYAL DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
518501

5. AKKAMREDDI MADHUSUDHAN REDDY, S/O VENKATA KONDA
REDDY, AGED ABOUT 71 YEARS, OCC. CULTIVATION, R/O FLAT NO
505, SYMPHONY HEIGHTS, NGO COLONY, NANDYAL TOWN AND
DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH. 518501

...RESPONDENT(S):**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1.TURAGA SAI SURYA

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 an appropriate Order, Direction or Writ more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of respondents No. 3 and 4 in interfering with petitioner's possession over the land admeasuring an extent of Ac. 1.29 cents in RS No. 635/2, within the revenue limits of Nandyal Town and Mandal, Nandyal District, Andhra Pradesh, at the behest of the 5th respondent, including threats to settle private disputes, is highly illegal, an arbitrary exercise of power, unjust, and violative of the principles of Natural Justice, also violates Articles 14, 19, 21, and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently, direct the respondents 3 and 4 not to interfere with his life and liberty, and to pass...”

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

3. Sri T.Sai Surya, learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Writ Petition is initiated by the wholly arbitrary and illegal interference of Respondents Nos.3 and 4, acting at the behest of Respondent No.5, in a civil dispute concerning the Petitioner's land admeasuring Ac.1.29 cents in R.S.No.635/2, Nandyal. Despite the Petitioner's lawful title and possession, duly established under a registered sale deed and fortified by dismissal of O.S.No.14 of 2023 filed by Respondent No.5, the police have usurped jurisdiction by summoning the Petitioner, threatening false criminal cases, and

directing him to settle private disputes. The Petitioner, having no efficacious alternative remedy, therefore invokes the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 seeking a writ of mandamus restraining Respondent Nos.3 and 4 from interfering with his possession, life, and liberty.

4. Sri P.Ajay Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader, on written instructions, submits that the present Writ Petition is wholly misconceived and devoid of merits, as the alleged grievance of the Petitioner pertains to a civil dispute over immovable property in Survey No.635/2, Nandyal. It is submitted that on 14.04.2026, when an altercation arose between the Petitioner and Respondent No.5, the police merely responded to a Dial-100 call, pacified both parties, and advised them to seek redressal before the competent civil court. No coercive action was taken, nor was the Petitioner summoned, as the matter is purely civil in nature. The Respondent Police have acted strictly in accordance with law, and the Petitioner has an efficacious remedy before the civil court which alone is empowered to adjudicate such disputes. Hence, the Writ Petition is not maintainable and deserves to be dismissed.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, and recording the submissions of the learned Assistant Government Pleader, the Writ Petition is disposed of, directing Respondent Nos.3 and 4 not to interfere henceforth in the civil dispute between the Petitioner and Respondent No.5, without following due process of law.

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

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

Dr.Y. LAKSHMANA RAO, J

Date: 30.04.2026
VTS