



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

[3573]

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

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE BALAJI MEDAMALLI

WRIT PETITION NO: 12631/2026

Between:

1. JANGALAPALLI NATARAJA, S/O. J. CHINNA VENKATA SUBBAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS, R/O. D. NO. 2/73, MIDUTHURU,
KHAJIPETA, Y.S.R. KADAPA DISTRICT - 516203.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI,
AMARAVATHI. 522238.

2. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, VIJAYAWADA-GUNTUR
HIGHWAY, MANGALAGIRI, GUNTUR DISTRICT. 522503.

3. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, KADAPA, Y.S.R. KADAPA
DISTRICT. 516004.

4. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, PRODDATUR RURAL POLICE
STATION, PRODDATUR RURAL CIRCLE OFFICE, Y.S.R. KADAPA
DISTRICT - 516360.

5. KURRA SREENIVASULU, S/O. K. VENKATA .RAMUDU, AGED
ABOUT 39 YEARS, R/O. 11-49/2, ACHARYULA COLONY,
PRODDATUR TOWN AND MANDAL, Y.S.R. KADAPA DISTRICT -
516360.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue an order or a direction or a writ, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondent No. 4 in calling the petitioner to Proddatur Rural P.S. and pressurizing him to settle the civil dispute with the unofficial respondent No. 5 as illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional, and to consequently direct the Respondent No. 4 not to interfere with the civil dispute between the petitioner and the unofficial respondent No.5 and not to call the petitioner to police station and not to harass him, and to pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the Respondent No. 4 not to call the petitioner to Proddatur Rural P.S. and not to pressurize the petitioner to compromise the civil dispute with the unofficial respondent No.5, pending disposal of the main writ petition, and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.DASAM DURGA SHIVA SAI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following:

ORDER

The present Writ Petition came to be filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeing the following relief:

“...to issue an order or a direction or a writ, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondent No. 4 in calling the petitioner to Proddatur Rural P.S. and pressurizing him to settle the civil dispute with the unofficial respondent No. 5, as illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional, and to consequently direct the Respondent No. 4 not to interfere with the civil dispute between the petitioner and the unofficial respondent No.5 and not to call the petitioner to police station and not to harass him, and to pass such other order...”

2. The case of the writ petitioner, in brief, is that the petitioner, who was carrying on a small printing press business, came into acquaintance with unofficial respondent No.5 and later developed cordial relations with him. It was submitted that the petitioner borrowed Rs.8,00,000/- from unofficial respondent No.5 under a promissory note dated 26.09.2024 and subsequently discharged the said debt. However, the promissory note was not returned on the ground that it had been misplaced. Thereafter, unofficial respondent No.5 allegedly made false claims that the amount remained unpaid and refused to return the promissory note. It was further submitted that, at the instance of unofficial respondent No.5, respondent No.4 and his subordinates repeatedly called the petitioner to the police station, pressurized him to settle the dispute, and threatened to foist false criminal cases against him despite the dispute being purely civil in nature. Therefore, the petitioner constrained to file the present writ petition.

3. Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner and learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home, representing Respondent Nos.1 to 4.

4. During the course of hearing, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home, on written instructions dated 04.05.2026, submitted that three Public Grievance Redressal System (PGRS) petitions were lodged by the 5th respondent herein and the same were forwarded to the SDPO, Proddatur, for enquiry and submission of report. Thereafter, the said petitions were forwarded to the Circle Inspector, Proddatur, who is the 4th respondent herein, for enquiry and necessary action. It was further submitted that, in connection therewith, the petitioner was called for enquiry; however, the petitioner informed over phone that the dispute between him and the 5th respondent pertains to payment of certain due amounts. Since there was no written proof to substantiate the allegation of cheating against the petitioner and as the dispute relates to payment of due amounts between the parties, which is purely civil in nature, the 5th respondent was advised to approach the competent Civil Court for redressal of his grievance and settlement of the dispute. He further submits that the allegation regarding the petitioner being called to the Police Station is baseless and vague.

5. Recording the same, the Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent authorities not to interfere with the petitioner's daily life and personal liberty, except by following due process of law. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall also stand closed.

JUSTICE BALAJI MEDAMALLI

Date: 15.05.2026

SR

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE BALAJI MEDAMALLI

Writ Petition No: 12631 of 2026

Date: 15.05.2026

SR