



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

[3558]

FRIDAY, THE FIRST DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA

WRIT PETITION NO: 12131/2026

Between:

1. PANEM SANTAMMA, W/O PANEM VIJAYA BHASKAR REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS, OCC HOUSEWIFE, R/O FLAT
NO.206, BRINDAVAN APARTMENTS, VINUKONDA, GUNTUR
DISTRICT (PALNADU DISTRICT), ANDHRA PRADESH -
522647.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, NARSARAOPETA I TOWN
POLICE STATION, NARSAFAOPETA, PALNADU (GUNTUR)
DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH. 522601.

2. THE SUB-DIVISIONAL POLICE OFFICER, NARSARAOPETA,
PALNADU (GUNTUR) DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
522601.

3. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, PALNADU (GUNTUR)
DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH. 522601.

4. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, ANDHRA PRADESH
STATE POLICE HEADQUARTERS, MANGALAGIRI,
AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

522503.

5.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY. DEPARTMENT OF HOME, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.522238.

6.PANEM SRUJANA REDDY, D/O PANEM VIJAYA BHASKAR REDDY, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS OLD, OCC HOUSEWIFE, R/O - C/O KANDUKURI KATAM RAJU, NEW GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL, NEAR BALA TRIPURA TIFFIN CENTER, NAVODAYA NAGAR, NARASARAOPETA, PALNADU DISTRICT. 522601.

7.KANDUKURI KATAMARAJU, S/O MADHAVA RAO, AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS, OCC: DAILY WAGE LABOUR, R/O NEW GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL, NEAR BALA TRIPURA TIFFIN CENTER, NAVODAYA NAGAR, NARASARAOPETA, PALNADU DISTRICT-522601.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.SANKU DURGA RAMACHANDRA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.THE ADVOCATE GENERAL

The Court made the following:

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY
AND**

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA

WRIT PETITION No.12131 of 2026

ORDER: *(Per Hon'ble Sri Justice Cheekati Manavendranath Roy)*

This writ petition for habeas corpus under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is filed seeking direction to respondent Nos.1 to 4 to produce respondent No.6 by name Panem Srujana Reddy, who is a major aged about 29 years, alleged to be in the illegal confinement of respondent No.7, before the Court and then to set her at liberty.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Assistant Government Pleader attached to the office of the learned Advocate General appearing for the official respondents 1 to 5.

3. The 6th respondent by name Panem Srujana Reddy (hereinafter referred to as 'corpus') is the daughter of the petitioner. She is a major aged about 29 years. The petitioner, who is the mother of the corpus, herself has disclosed in the cause title of the writ petition that the age of the corpus is 29 years. Therefore, admittedly, the corpus is a grown up woman and she is a major.

4. According to the petitioner, her husband has been running a cool drinks shop in Vinukonda Town and the 7th respondent used to frequently visit the said shop and developed acquaintance with the corpus and he has informed her that he is in love with the corpus and influenced her mind. It is stated that in the year 2021, when the corpus was in a vulnerable state, the 7th respondent has threatened her that he would commit suicide by writing a letter stating that she is

responsible for his suicidal death if she refuses to accompany him. Thus, by subjecting her to psychological and emotional intimidation and by blackmailing her, he compelled the corpus to leave the house along with him against her will. Thereafter, the petitioner is not aware of the whereabouts of the corpus and they have no communication with her. It is alleged that the 7th respondent has illegally confined the corpus in a room in Narasaraopet and subjected her to repeated sexual assault and did not permit her to visit the house of the petitioner and he restricted her movements. The corpus has also given birth to a child while she was in the company of the 7th respondent. It is further stated that the 7th respondent is now addicted to consuming alcohol and he has been subjecting the corpus to physical harassment while he is in intoxicated condition.

5. Therefore, the present writ petition for habeas corpus is filed seeking the aforesaid relief.

6. Today, at the time of hearing this writ petition for admission, the corpus, who is the 6th respondent, is also present in the Court. We have interacted with her in the open Court. She has attended the Court along with her daughter, who is aged about four years. She has clearly and unequivocally stated before the Court that the 7th respondent is her husband and she has been living with him for the last five years and they are in a relationship even though their marriage did not take place and the daughter was born to them during their cohabitation with each other for the last five years. She has further stated that she herself has voluntarily accompanied the 7th respondent without informing her parents and that they resided together in a house in Narasaraopet and had cohabitation. It is stated by her that now the 7th respondent is addicted to vices like consuming

alcohol and he has been subjecting her to physical assault and unable to bear the said harassment, she left his company and went to the house of her mother, who is the petitioner.

7. Thus, from the aforesaid statement given by the corpus herself, it is evident that she was not forcibly or deceptively taken away by the 7th respondent as alleged in the writ petition. The corpus herself voluntarily accompanied the 7th respondent when she was a major and lived with him and had cohabitation with him without any marriage and also gave birth to a child who is now aged about four years. Thus, they are in a relationship with each other with their free will and consent and lived together. Now, as the 7th respondent is addicted to vices like consuming alcohol and he has been harassing her, disputes cropped up between them and, therefore, the corpus left for her parents house and thereafter, the present writ petition came to be filed by her mother.

8. Therefore, from the statement of the corpus, it is obvious and evident that she is not illegally confined or detained by the 7th respondent so as to maintain this writ petition for habeas corpus. It is only when it is found that the corpus has been illegally detained or confined against her will and consent by the 7th respondent, then only the writ petition for habeas corpus is maintainable.

9. If any differences arose between the corpus and the 7th respondent as alleged by the corpus, she has to work out her remedies according to law by taking recourse to law in appropriate forum. But, the petitioner is not justified in filing this writ petition with all false allegations, which are proved to be false from the statement given by the corpus in the open Court today. The writ petition has been filed with all misleading facts and it is undoubtedly a false writ petition. The writ petitioner is warned not to file any such false writ petitions in

future with false and misleading facts, thereby wasting the valuable time of the Court. The facts are terribly distorted in the pleadings of the writ petition to maintain this writ petition. The said practice is deprecated.

10. Therefore, as it is not found that the corpus has been illegally detained or confined by the 7th respondent as alleged by the writ petitioner, the writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, interlocutory applications, if any pending, in this case shall stand closed.

JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY

JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA

Date: 01.05.2026
IBL

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA

WRIT PETITION No.12131 of 2026

Dt: 01.05.2026

IBL