



**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

**THURSDAY, THE SIXTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

WRIT PETITION NO: 4345 OF 2018

Between:

A.V.S.Ram Mohan, S/o Venkateshwar Rao, Aged about 63 years, Occ ; Retired Bank Employee / Agriculture, Rio 40/3RT, Seetarama Nivas, Vijayanagar Colony, Hyderabad.

.....PETITIONER

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Home Department, Secretariate, Hyderabad.
2. The District Collector, Suryapet District.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Kodad, Suryapet District.
4. The Tahsildar, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Suryapet District, Suryapet.
6. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kodada, Suryapet District.
7. The Inspector of Police, Kodad Rural, Kodad, Suryapet District.
8. The Station House Officer, Chintalapalem Police Station, Suryapet District.
9. Ajmeera Mangtha, S/o. Vasuram, 71 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
10. Ajmeera Somla, S/o Deepia, 71 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
11. Banothu Sakru, S/o Champia, 61 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
12. Ajmeera Badya, S/o Singya, 76 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
13. Banothu Punna, S/o Patchya, 41 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.



14. Rupavath Laxmi, W/o Patchya, 56 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
15. Dharavath Dwali, W/o Bheemla, 61 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
16. Badavath Koti, W/o Kasya, 51 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
17. Ajmeera Ranga Rao, S/o Badya, 42 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
18. Bhukya Mangi, W/o Hanuma, 61 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
19. Bhukya Johnkee, W/o Sakriya, 56 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
20. Lakavath Kotya, S/o Mukunda Naik, 55 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
21. Lakavath Balu, S/o Mukunda Naik, 51 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
22. Lakavath Laxman, S/o Mukunda Naik, 43 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
23. Lakavath Hanuma, S/o Mukunda Naik, 38 yrs, Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
24. Lakavath Narsimha Rao, S/o Mukunda Naik, 35 yrs., Agriculturist, R/o. Peekla Naik Thanda, H/o. Thammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.

...RESPONDENTS

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 appropriate writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the inaction of the respondent nos. 2 to 8 in not providing police protection in spite of the orders dated 08.12.2011 in C.C.No.178 of 2011 of this Hon'ble High Court and also representations of the petitioner from the respondent nos 9 to 24 and their henchmen as illegal, arbitrary, unjust and consequently direct the respondent nos. 2 to 8 to take action on the petitioners complaint and grant police protection to the petitioner and their activities of agriculture in his agricultural land admeasuring Ac. 39.22 gnts., in Sy.No. 62/6, 62/7, 62/8, 63/4, 63/5 and 63/6 of Tammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Surya pet District.

I.A.NO:1 OF 2018



2025:TSHC:58841

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 issue direction, directing the respondent No.2 to 8 to extend the protection to the petitioner's activities of his agricultural land admeasuring Ac. 39.22 gnts., in Sy.No. 62/6, 62/7, 62/8, 63/4, 63/5 and 63/6 of Tammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Surya pet District, pending disposal of the Main writ petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner : SRI. V.V.RAMANA

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 & 5 to 8 : SRI D.PRADEEP, AGP FOR HOME

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.2 to 4 : GP FOR REVENUE

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.9 to 24 : --

The Court made the following ORDER

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI****WRIT PETITION No.4345 OF 2018****ORDER:**

This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India seeking the following relief/s:-

“...to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the inaction of the respondent Nos. 2 to 8 in not providing police protection in spite of the orders dated 08.12.2011 in CC No. 178 of 2011 of this Hon’ble High Court and also representations of the petitioner from the respondent Nos.9 to 24 and their henchmen as illegal, arbitrary, unjust and consequently direct the respondent Nos.2 to 8 to take action on the petitioners complaint and grant police protection to the petitioner and their activities of agriculture in his agricultural land admeasuring Ac. 39.22 gnts., in Sy.No. 62/6, 62/7, 62/8, 63/4, 63/5 and 63/6 of Tammaram Village, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District and to pass.....”

2. Heard Mr.V.V.Ramana, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr.D.Pradeep, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home appearing for respondent Nos.1 to 8.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent Nos. 2 to 8 failed to provide police protection despite the orders dated 08.12.2011 passed by this Court in C.C. No. 178 of 2011. He further submits that, during the pendency of the present writ petition, respondent No. 4/Tahsildar, in coordination with the police authorities, executed the certificate of delivery of possession

with respect to the re-transferred land on 26.12.2011, pursuant to which the petitioner is now in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the said property.

4. However, learned counsel submits that certain private respondents, specifically respondent Nos. 9 to 24, have been interfering with the petitioner's possession from time to time. Consequently, the petitioner made representations to the police authorities seeking protection. It is therefore prayed that this Court may issue a direction to the police to extend protection to the petitioner as and when any interference with possession occurs at the instance of respondent Nos. 9 to 24. Learned counsel contends that such a direction would enable the petitioner to continue to enjoy peaceful possession of the property and accordingly prays for appropriate orders.

5. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home submits that the directions of this Court in C.C. No. 178 of 2011 have been duly complied with. The possession of the property has been delivered to the petitioner in coordination with the revenue authorities, thereby satisfying the order of this Court. However, he



opposes the petitioner's request for issuance of a perpetual direction for police protection, submitting that such a direction would not be legally sustainable.

6. I have perused the material available on record.

7. The grievance of the petitioner is that despite the orders of this Court in the contempt case, the respondent authorities failed to provide police protection. However, the fair admission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner clearly indicates that the directions of this Court were indeed complied with the revenue authorities, with the assistance of the police, executed the delivery of possession under due *panchanama* and mediators' report, and the petitioner is presently in possession of the property.

8. In view of the above, it is evident that the prayer of the petitioner for implementation of the earlier order has been effectively redressed. The further request for a continuous or standing direction to the police to provide protection "as and when" interference occurs is not legally tenable, as such an order would amount to granting a blanket writ direction without there being an existing cause of action. As observed by the Hon'ble

Supreme Court, writ jurisdiction cannot be invoked to anticipate future contingencies or to issue preventive directions of an indefinite nature (*State of Bihar v. P.P. Sharma*, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 222).

9. Moreover, any alleged interference by private parties in the future would constitute a fresh cause of action, for which the petitioner would be entitled to avail appropriate legal remedies in accordance with law, including seeking assistance from the police authorities or the competent civil court. While earlier directions of this Court mandated the respondents to extend police protection to facilitate delivery of possession, such directions cannot be indefinitely extended to cover future hypothetical events or unspecified interferences by third parties.

10. In light of the foregoing discussion and upon consideration of all relevant facts and submissions, this Court is of the considered view that no further directions are warranted. However, the petitioner is at liberty to avail appropriate remedies under law as and when any cause of action arises. Needless to state, the police authorities shall be entitled to take appropriate action in accordance



with law if any such interference with possession is brought to their notice.

11. With this direction, this writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous Petitions, pending if any, shall stand closed.

SD/-AHMED ABDULLAH KHAN
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To

1. The Principal Secretary, Home Department, Secretariate, State of Telangana at Hyderabad.
2. The District Collector, Suryapet District.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Kodad, Suryapet District.
4. The Tahsildar, Chintalapalem Mandal, Suryapet District.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Suryapet District, Suryapet.
6. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kodada, Suryapet District.
7. The Inspector of Police, Kodad Rural, Kodad, Suryapet District.
8. The Station House Officer, Chintalapalem Police Station, Suryapet District.
9. Two CCs to GP FOR REVENUE, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad. [OUT]
10. Two CCs to GP FOR HOME, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad. [OUT]
11. One CC to SRI V.V.RAMANA, Advocate [OPUC]
12. Two CD Copies

SA
TJ

Jks



2025:TSHC:58841

HIGH COURT

DATED:06/11/2025

ORDER

WP.No.4345 of 2018



**DISPOSING OF THE W.P
WITHOUT COSTS.**

(16) JKS
12/3/26