



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

[3521]

MONDAY, THE FOURTH DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 33291/2025

Between:

1. KONAPURAM HANUMANTHARAYUDU, S/O LATE MALA
SANJEEVAPPA, AGE ABOUT 70 YEARS R/O D.NO. 17-6-393,
HASNABAD, HINDUPUR, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI,
AMARAVATI.

2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT.

3. THE SHO, HINDUPUR I TOWN POLICE STATION, SRI SATYA SAI
DISTRICT.

4. SAMI ULLAH, S/O BASHA SAB, AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS, R/O
D.NO. 17-6-441 HINDUPUR, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT.

5. SHAKILA BEGUM, W/O IQBAL AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS, R/O D.NO.
17-6-441 HINDUPUR, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. KASHAPOGU SURESH

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 more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the inaction of the Respondents No. 2 and 3 to provide Police Aid for implementing the permanent injunction order dated 18-02-1993 in OS. No. 4/1993 on the file of the Court of the District Munsif at Hindupur and Protection order dated 27-12-1993 in I.A No. 877/1993 in O.S. No. 4/1993, order dated 21-01-2000 in O.S No.6/2025 on the file of the Junior Civil Judge Court at Hindupur and order dated 30-06-2003 in A.S No. 19/2000 in Senior Civil Judge court at Hindupur, order .dated 13-10-2008 in O.S No.145/2001 on the file of the Junior Civil Judge Court at Hindupur and also in duly considering the petitioners Representations dated 04-03-2024, 03-04-2025, 09-06-2025 and 30-06-2025 in the interest of justice...”

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

3. Mr. Kashapogu Suresh, learned counsel for the Petitioner, submits that Respondents No.2 and 3 have failed to provide police aid for implementing the permanent injunction order dated 18.02.1993 in O.S. No. 4 of 1993 on the file of the learned District Munsif, Hindupur.

4. Sri P.Ajay Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader, submits that there is no order from the learned Civil Court granting police protection to the Petitioner.

5. A learned Single Judge of this Court, in **Vanaparthi Subramanyam v. State of Andhra Pradesh**¹ at paragraph No.11, observed that where a decree of permanent injunction has been granted by a competent Civil Court, the

¹ W.P.No.20555 of 2022

plaintiff therein is entitled to seek police aid either from the Civil Court which passed the decree or from this Court by invoking its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. This view was taken by placing reliance on the judgment of a learned Single Judge of this Court in **Rai Naramma v. State of Andhra Pradesh**².

6. In this connection, it is also appropriate to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **P.R. Murlidharan v. Swami Dharmananda Theertha Padar**³, wherein it was held that the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot be invoked to adjudicate complex and disputed questions of fact. It was further held that a writ of police protection is permissible only to effectuate rights already crystallized by a decree or by a clear and unambiguous interlocutory order of a competent Civil Court.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the Writ Petition is disposed of with directing the Respondent Police to provide necessary police protection to the Petitioner and to take appropriate steps in accordance with law. It is further made clear that, while providing such police protection, if the Investigating Officer comes to know of any order passed by a Superior or Appellate Court granting relief different from that granted in the decree and judgment in O.S. No. 4 of 1993, the police shall be at liberty to act in accordance with law by duly complying with the orders of the higher courts.

² 2021 (1) ALT 426

³ (2006) 4 SCC 201

8. 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: 04.05.2026
PRA

193

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 33291 of 2025

Date: 04.05.2026

PRA