



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

**[3521]**

WEDNESDAY, THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 17125/2023**

**Between:**

1. MANDALA SUJATHA, W/O. RAMANJANEYULU, AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS, HOUSEWIFE, R/O. D.NO. 7-250, YEGUVAGADDA, PENUGONDA VILLAGE, PENUGONDA MANDAL, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

**...PETITIONER**

**AND**

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

2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, , PUTTAPARTHI- 51513, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT.

3. THE CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, RODDAM POLICE STATION, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT.

4. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE, , RODDAM POLICE STATION, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT.

5. BOYA JAYARAMAAPPA, , S/O. PEDDAPPAIAH, KALLAKUNTA, HAMLET OF NALLUR, RODDAM MANDAL, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

6. BOYA HANUMANTAPPA, S/O. PEDDAPPAIAH, KALLAKUNTA, HAMLET OF NALLUR, RODDAM MANDAL, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

7. BOYA SRIRAMAAPPA, , S/O. PEDDAPPAIAH, KALLAKUNTA, HAMLET OF NALLUR, RODDAM MANDAL, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

8. B NARAYANAPPA, , S/O. NOT KNOWN, HAMLET OF NALLUR, RODDAM MANDAL, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

**...RESPONDENT(S):**

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1. JADA SRAVAN KUMAR

**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 a Writ, Order or Direction particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the 4th respondent i.e., The Station House Officer, Roddam Police Station, Roddam Mandal, Sri Satya Sai District, in not providing Police protection preventing the interference of the three sons and son-in-law of late Boya Peddappaiah, S/o Narasimhaappa, namely, 1) Boya Jayaramaappa, 2) Boya Hanumantappa, 3) Boya Sriramaappa and 4) B.Narayanappa with my peaceful possession and enjoyment of the above said land belonging to me including the agricultural operations that may be carrying on from time to time as seasonal wise by me through my men, servants, labor etc., despite my representation dated 03.05.2023 in accordance with the law laid down in W.P No.10881 of 2021 as illegal, arbitrary and violation of the principles of natural justice and also violation of Article 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondent No.4 to provide Police protection expeditiously as early as possible in respect of my property in an extent of Ac.4.97 cents in Sy.No.144 situated in Nalluru Village, Roddam Mandal according to law...”*

2. Heard the learned counsel for Petitioner and learned Assistant Government Pleader.
3. Mr.Jada Sravan Kumar, learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that Respondent Nos.5 to 8 have been interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the property of the Petitioner.
4. Sri P.Ajay Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader, on written instructions, submits that civil disputes are pending between the Petitioner and the unofficial Respondents at various stages, and if appropriate directions are given by any civil court, the police would give necessary protection.
5. The learned counsel appearing for Respondent Nos.5 to 8 submits that the father of Respondent Nos.5 to 8 instituted a suit in O.S.No.94 of 1991, which was decreed against the Petitioner. The Petitioner preferred a first appeal, which was allowed in his favour, thereby setting aside the decree and

judgment passed by the learned Trial court. The father of Respondent Nos.5 to 8 then preferred a second appeal, but the same was dismissed as abated owing to his death, and no legal representatives were brought on record at that time. Subsequently, the legal representatives of the father of Respondent Nos.5 to 8 were brought on record belatedly, and an application to that effect is pending before this Court.

6. Be that as it may, if Respondent Nos.5 to 8 have been disturbing the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the Petitioner, the Petitioner has a remedy by filing an interlocutory application in the pending second appeal before this Court and seek appropriate relief. In view of the availability of an alternative efficacious remedy on the civil side, no orders can be passed directing the Respondents to provide police protection to the Petitioner's land.

7. However, considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, and recording the submissions of the learned Assistant Government Pleader, the Writ Petition is disposed of granting liberty to the Petitioner to approach this Court in the pending second appeal by filing an appropriate application seeking restraint against Respondent Nos.5 to 8 from interfering with his peaceful possession and enjoyment of the property, if so advised.

8. Accordingly, 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: 18.02.2026

PRA

174

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

**WRIT PETITION NO: 17125 of 2023**

Date: 18.02.2026  
PRA