



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

**WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY NINTH DAY OF OCTOBER  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 6840 OF 2018**

**Between:**

Telagamalla Ravi, S/o: Nagesh, aged about 28 years, Occ: Business,  
R/o Urlugonda Village, Mothey Mandal, Suryapet District, Telangana.

**...PETITIONER**

**AND**

1. The State of TS, Rep by its principle Secretary, Home Department  
Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The Superintendent of Police, Nalgonda District Telanagana.
3. The Station House Officer, P.S, Mothey, Mothey Mandal, Suryapet District,  
Telangana.
4. Kandula Muthayala, R/o H.No. 1-30, Komarabanda Village, Kodada 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 a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus declaring the inaction of the Respondent No 2 and 3 in initiating appropriate legal action against Respondent No 4 herein in pursuance to the Petitioners complaint to the 3rd Respondent dt 10-11-2017 and complaint to the 2nd Respondent dt 08-12-2017 as illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional, malafide and consequently direct the Respondents No 2 and 3 herein to forthwith initiate appropriate legal action against Respondent No 4 herein.



2025:TSHC:47545

**IA NO: 1 OF 2018**

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.2 and 3 to consider the petitioner's complaint to the 3rd Respondent dt: 10-11-2017 and complaint to the 2nd Respondent dt: 08-12-2017 pending disposal of the above writ petition

**Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI R. MANGULAL**

**Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 to 3: AGP FOR HOME**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.4:----**

**The Court made the following: ORDER**



THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N. TUKARAMJI

WRIT PETITION No.6840 OF 2018

ORDER:

This Writ Petition is filed with the following relief:

*"To issue a Writ or order or direction more particularly, one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the inaction of respondent Nos.2 and 3 in initiating appropriate legal action against respondent No.4 herein in pursuance to the petitioner's complaint to the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent dated 10.11.2017 and complaint to the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent dated 08.12.2017, as illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional, mala fide and consequently direct the respondent Nos.2 and 3 herein to forthwith initiate appropriate legal action against respondent No.4 herein ....."*

2. None appeared for the petitioner.
3. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home submits that upon receipt of the petitioner's reports and after due enquiry, it was found that the allegations were civil in nature. Accordingly, the petitioner was advised to avail appropriate remedies under civil law. Hence, the contention against the respondent police

authorities for not registering a crime is untenable. He therefore prays for dismissal of the writ petition.

4. I have perused the material available on record.

5. The contention of the petitioner is that the complaints dated 10.11.2017 and 08.12.2017 were not considered by the respondent police authorities. However, the explanation offered by the respondents indicates that the representations were duly considered, and, upon exercising their discretion, the respondent police advised the petitioner to pursue civil remedies. Thus, the petitioner's contention remains *ex facie* unsubstantiated. Nevertheless, if the petitioner is aggrieved by the non-registration of a crime, he ought to have availed the appropriate statutory remedies available under the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Cr.P.C.) or the *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023* (BNSS).

6. The legal position governing matters of this nature is well settled. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in *Sakiri Vasu v. State of U.P. & Others* (AIR 2008 SC 907) and *M. Subramaniam v. S. Janaki & Others* (AIR 2020 SC 387), has categorically held that seeking a direction for registration of a crime simpliciter under



Article 226 of the Constitution of India is not maintainable unless the aggrieved person has first exhausted the statutory remedies available under the Cr.P.C./BNSS.

7. In view of the settled legal position, and as the petitioner has not chosen to avail the alternative statutory remedies, and there being no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances warranting interference by this Court, the prayer for issuance of a direction to register a crime is not maintainable. However, the petitioner's right to avail appropriate remedies available under law, if the cause of action still survives, is reserved.

8. With this direction, the Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition, shall stand closed.

Sd/-M.NAGAMANI  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. One CC to Sri R. Mangulal, Advocate [OPUC]
2. Two CCs to GP for Home, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT]
3. Two CD Copies

T J  
PMK



2025:TSHC:47545

**HIGH COURT**

**DATED:29/10/2025**

**ORDER**

**WP.No.6840 of 2018**



**DISPOSING OF THE WRIT PETITION  
WITHOUT COSTS**

⑥ PA  
3/12/25