

APHC010105632024



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 5488 OF 2024

Between:

1. Shaik Khadar Vali, S/o Bademiah, aged about 57 years, Advocate by Profession, R/o 203, Imded Ghar, Opp. Head Post Office, Vijayawada-520001, NTR District, Andhra Pradesh.

...Petitioner

AND

1. State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep., by its Principal Secretary, Home Department, Secretariat buildings, Velagapudi, Andhra Pradesh.

2. The Commissioner of Police, NTR District, Vijayawada Commissionerate, Andhra Pradesh.

3. The Station House Officer, Machavaram Police Station, Vijayawada City, NTR District, Andhra Pradesh.

4. Seelam Rahil Kumari, W/o Late Netanial, Aged about 48 years. Business, R/o D.No.50-11-3/15, Mastan Gar, Gangireddula Dibba, Gunadala, Vijayawada-520005, NTR District, Andhra Pradesh

...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 in the nature of writ of mandamus, declaring the action respondent no. 3 in harassing me by repeatedly summoning me to the 3rd respondent police station without there being any crime registered against me and forcing me to enter into

compromise with respondent no.4 regarding a Civil Dispute, i.e., the Suit bearing O.S.No.225 of 2024 pending before the Hon'ble Civil Judge, Junior Division, Vijayawada, and settle the dispute as illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional, against principles of natural justice and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of Indian Constitution and consequently direct the respondent no. 3 to not to harass the petitioner by summoning him to the 3rd respondent police station and harass him in the name of enquiry and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2024

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. 3 not to summon me to the 3rd respondent police station and force me to enter in to compromise with 4th respondent regarding the Suit bearing O.S.No. 225 of 2024 pending before the Hon'ble Civil Judge, Junior Division, Vijayawada pending disposal of the above Writ petition and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner: NERELLA S V RAVI TEJA

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

**Counsel for the Respondents: VENKATA DURGA RAO ANANTHA-
19014/AP/1159/2013**

APHC010525322024



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026
PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 27041 OF 2024

Between:

1. KANUGULA VENKATA RAMANAMMA, S/o.Satya Rao, Aged about 58 years Occ:House Hold, R/o.Veraayavalasa Village, Etcherla Mandal, Srikakulam District.

...Petitioner

AND

1. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, Srikakulam Rural Police Station, Srikakulam, Srikakulam District.
2. The TahasildarcumMandal Executive Magistrate, Srikakulam Mandal, Srikakulam District.
3. The Superintendent of Police, Srikakulam, Srikakulam District.
4. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep by its Principal Secretary, Home Department, Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravathi, Guntur District.
5. Eppili Shiva Prasad, S/o. Late Appa Rao, Aged about 58 years, R/o. Kanugulavaripeta Village, Srikakulam Mandal, Srikakulam 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 to declare the action of the Respondents No.1 and 2 in interfering in the civil dispute pending between the Petitioner and the Respondent No.5 and others in respect of the suit schedule property in O.S.No.238/2021 on the file the Principal Junior Civil Judge, Srikakulam without following due process of law as arbitrary, illegal and violation of Article

14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents No.1 and 2 not to interfere in the civil disputes pending between the Petitioner and the Respondent No.5 and others without following due process of law in the interest of justice.

IA NO: 1 OF 2024

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 may be pleased to direct the Respondents No.1 and 2 not to interfere in the civil disputes pending between the Petitioner and the Respondent No.5 and others without following due process of law

Counsel for the Petitioner: P NAGENDRA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR REVENUE

APHC010602622024



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 31424 OF 2024

Between:

1. SHAIK DADA KHALANDHARVALI, S/o.Shaik Mahabobsab, Aged about 59 years, Occ. Business R/o.D.No.6/122, Chitravathi Road, Puttaparthi Town and Mandal, Satya Sai District.

...Petitioner

AND

1. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, Puttaparthi Police Station, Satya Sai District.
2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Puttaparthi, Satya Sai District.
3. The Superintendent of Police, Puttaparthi, Satya Sai District.
4. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep by its Principal Secretary, Home Department, Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravathi, Guntur District.
5. Smt Konduru Alivelamma, W/o.Madhusudhanetty, Aged about 65 years, R/o.Sai Teja Apartments, Puttaparthi Town and Mandal, Satya Sai 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 to declare the action of the Respondents No.1 and 2 in interfering in the civil dispute pending between the Petitioner and the Respondent No.5 in respect of the suit schedule property in O.S.No.81/2019 on the file the Junior Civil Judge, Puttaparthi without following due process of

law as arbitrary, illegal, beyond jurisdiction and violation of Article 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents No.1 and 2 not to interfere in the civil disputes pending between the Petitioner and the Respondent No.5 and others

IA NO: 1 OF 2024

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 may be pleased to direct the Respondents No. 1 and 2 not to interfere in the civil disputes pending between the Petitioner and the Respondent No.5 and others without following due process of law

Counsel for the Petitioner: P NAGENDRA REDDY
Counsel for the Respondents:

APHC010009372025



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026
PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 1160 OF 2025

Between:

1. Kapadam Venkata Ramudu, S/o. Late K Subbaraydu, Age 59 years, R/o. D. No.2-62, Bondalawada Village, Narpala Mandal, Anantapur District.

...Petitioner

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Represented by its Principal Secretary, Home Department, A.P. Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravati, Guntur District.
2. The Superintendent of Police, Anantapur District at Anantapur.
3. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Anantapur Anantapur Rural, Anantapur District.
4. The Inspector of Police, Singanamala Police Station, Singanamala, Anantapur District.
5. The SubInspector of Police, Narpala Police Station, Narpala, Anantapur District.
6. Kapadam Venkatappa, s/o. Late K. Narayana, aged 74 years, R/o. D. N0.1-218A, Bondalawada Village, Narpala Mandal, Anantapur District.
7. Kapadam Venkata Narayana, s/o. Late K. Narayana, aged 60 years, R/o. D. No.2-61, Bondalawada Village, Narpala Mandal, Anantapur District.
8. Kapadam Subbarayudu, s/o. Late K. Narayana, aged 52 years, C/o. Bondaledu Sangalu, R/o. Kurugunta Village, Anantapur Rural Mandal, Anantapur District.
9. Kapadam Suryanarayana, s/o. Late K. Subbarayudu, aged 64 years, R/o. D. No.1-216, Bondalawada Village, Narpala Mandal, Anantapur District.

10. Kapadam Rajakullayappa, s/o. Late K. Kullayappa, aged 49 years, R/o. D. No.1-100, Bondalawada Village, Narpala Mandal, Anantapur District.
11. Konanki Madhusudhan Naidu, s/o. K. Jayashankar, aged 34 years, R/o. D. NO.I-68A, Bondalawada Village, Narpala Mandal, Anantapur District.
12. Kapadam Tirupalu, S/o. K. Suryanarayana, aged 40 years, R/o. D. No.1-216, Bondalawada Village, Narpala Mandal, Anantapur 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 writ, order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus declaring the action of the respondent No. 4 and 5 calling the petitioner and pressuring the petitioner to settle the civil disputes O.S No.400/2021, O.S NO.1326/2023 and O.S NO.1309 of 2023 on the file of III. Addl. Junior Civil Judge, Anantapur at the instance of respondent no.6 to 12 as illegal, arbitrary and violative of principles of natural justice and fundamental rights guaranteed under Constitution of India consequently directing the respondents not to interfere in the civil dispute pending between the parties and pass orders

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

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 directing the respondent No.4 & 5 not to interfere in the civil disputes O.S No.400/2021, O.S NO.1326/2023 and O.S NO.1309 of 2023 on the file of III. Addl. Junior Civil Judge, Anantapur and pass orders

Counsel for the Petitioner: SIVA NAGARJUNA SIDHADAPU
Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

APHC010696682025



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026
PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 35726 OF 2025

Between:

1. Nallamakala Ramanaiah, S/o. Late Kasthuraiah, Aged about 48 Years, Occ Cultivation, R/o. Manavali Village, Ojili Mandal, Tirupati District, Pin-524421.
2. Nallamakula Ravi Kumar, Nallamakala Ravi, S/o. Late Kasthuraiah, Aged about 50 Years, Occ :Cultivation, R/o. Manavali Village, Ojili Mandal, Tirupati District, Pin 524421

...Petitioners

AND

1. State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary to Government, Home Department, Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravati, Guntur District, Pin 522238.
2. Superintendent of Police, Tirupati District at Tirupati, Pin 517501.
3. Deputy Superintendent of Police, Naidupet, Tirupati District, Pin 524126.
4. Station House Officer, Ojili Police Station, Tirupati District, Pin 524402.
5. Panta Ramanamma, W/o. Srinivasulu Reddy, Aged about 55 Years, Occ House Wife, R/o. Mittathmakuru Village, Gudur Mandal, Tirupati District, Pin 524101.
6. Vendoti Sirisha, W/o. Narayana Reddy, Aged about 52 years, Occ House Wife, R/o. Karraballavolu Village and Post, Ojili Mandal, Tirupati District, Pin 524402.

...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 may be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of WRIT OF MANDAMUS declaring the action of

respondents, particularly the 4th respondent at the instance of 5th and 6th respondents in calling the petitioner to police station and interfering into civil dispute in between the petitioners with 5th and 6th respondent in pertains to civil suit in O.S.No.238 of 2025 pending on the file of the Court of learned Civil Judge (Junior Division) Naidupet, Tiruapti District and without there being any authority or sanction of law and declare the same as illegal, arbitrary. Capricious Manner and un constitutional and violative of Articles 14, 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the 4th respondent not to interfere in any manner with petitioners peaceful possession and enjoyment over the said agricultural landed property and pass such

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

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 may be pleased to direct the respondents, particularly 4th respondent and his personnel's not to insist the petitioners to appear before their authority nor interfere in any manner with petitioners peaceful possession and enjoyment over their agricultural landed property admeasuring with an extent of Ac. 2.70 cents and covered by Survey No. 133/2, and same was situated at Manavali Village in Ojili Mandal of Tirupati District, in the interest of Justice, in pending disposal of the main Writ Petition and pass such

Counsel for the Petitioners: MUCHAKAYALA NARAYANA

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

APHC010290332026



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026
PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 15259 OF 2026

Between:

1. Regilla Satya Venkata Ramakrishna Sastry, S/o Late R. Sundara Ramastry, Age 70 Years R/o dNo 53-33-9, KRM Colony, Seethammadhara, Near Church, Visakhapatnam.

...Petitioner

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Represented by its Principle Secretary Home Department, Secretariat Buildings at Velagapudi, Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh. -522238
2. The Commissiner of Police, Visakhapatnam-530001
3. The Station House Officer, Pothina Mallayyapalem Police Station Madhuravada, Visakhapatnam-530048
4. The SubInspector of Police, Pothina Mallayyapalempalem Police Station Madhuravada, Visakhapatnam-530048

...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 a Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the Respondent Police in unlawfully interfering with the Petitioner's peaceful possession, ownership and enjoyment of land admeasuring Ac.5712 Sq. Yards in Survey No.71/2, Patta No.272, situated at Paradesipalem Village and Panchayat, Bheemunipatnam Mandal, within the jurisdiction of Madurawada SRO Visakhapatnam District, and in illegally summoning the Petitioner to the police

station, threatening him with dispossession, coercing him to vacate his own land and meddling in a purely civil dispute, despite the subsisting the Judgment and Decree dated 05.12.2025 passed in O.S.No.390 of 2025 on the file of the learned Principal Civil Judge (Junior Division), Bheemunipatnam, as being wholly illegal, arbitrary. mala fide, without jurisdiction, unconstitutional. violative of principles of natural justice, and violating the Petitioners fundamental and constitutional rights guaranteed under Articles 14, 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India, and consequently direct the Respondents, their subordinates, men and agents not to interfere in any manner whatsoever with the Petitioner's peaceful possession, enjoyment and ownership of the aforesaid property, not to summon the Petitioner to the police station in connection with the subject civil dispute, and not to harass, intimidate or dispossess the Petitioner, and 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 Respondents not to interfere with the Petitioner's possession and enjoyment of the land admeasuring Ac. 5712 Sq. Yards in Survey No. 71/2, Patta No.272, situated at Paradesipalem Village and Panchayat, Bheemunipatnam Mandal, Madurawada SRO, Visakhapatnam District, and not call the petitioner to police station and not harass the petitioner to vacate his land and pass such other order or orders may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case, pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner: S SRINIVASA RAO
Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

APHC010323052026



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026
PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 16946 OF 2026

Between:

1. Smt Lalam Devudamma, W/o. Rambabu, aged about 68 years, D.No.25-15/3/A, Old Karnavanipalem, Old Gajuwaka, Visakhapatnam, Aadhaar No.2831 6618 7495

...Petitioner

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Through the Principal Secretary, Department of Home, Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravati, Guntur District-522238.
2. The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Visakhapatnam Range, Visakhapatnam. 530003
3. The Superintendent of Police, Anakapalli Anakapalli District-531002.
4. The Station House Officer, Atchuthapuram police station Anakapalli District-531011

...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 may be pleased to issue an appropriate Writ, Order or direction more particularly in the nature of Writ of MANDAMUS declaring the action of the official Respondents in interfering with the civil disputes regarding the subject schedule property covered in O.S.357/2004 on the file of Honble II Additional District Judge at Visakhapatnam as arbitrary, illegal, violative of Article 14, 21 and 300-A of the Constitution and consequently direct the

Respondents not to interfere in any manner with the life and limb of the petitioner except due process of law and pass such

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 may be pleased to direct the respondents to take action under Section 173 BNSS (Sec 154 Cr.P.C) on the reports dt.06-06-2026, 08-06-2026 and 15-06-2026 submitted by the writ petitioner, pending disposal of the main writ petition and to pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner: RAMESH BABU PEDAPALLI

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

APHC010318602026



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 17441 OF 2026

Between:

1. Narasimha Varma Aqua Farms, rep.by its Partners (1) Sagi Sri Veera Venkata Satya Surya Subrahmanya Narasimha Varma s/o Venkata Rama Gopala Krishnam Raju
2. Sagi Venkata Rama Gopala Krishnam Raju, s/o Narasimha Raju, residents of Door No. 1-119, old street, Gogannamatam, Mamidikuduru Mandal, Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Konaseema District,

...Petitioners

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Department of Home Affairs A.P. State Secretariat - 522 238 Velagapudi at Amaravathi, Guntur District, A.P.
2. The Superintendent of Police, West Godavari District Bhimavaram - 534 201 West Godavari District
3. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Narsapur Division Narsapur -534 275, West Godavari District
4. The Circle Inspector of Police, Palakol Rural Circle Palakol-534 260, West Godavari District
5. The Station House Officer, Elamanchili Police Station Elamanchili village- 534 268 Elamanchili Mandal, West Godavari 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 writ or order more particularly in the nature of writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the 4th and 5th respondents in interfering with civil dispute in O.S. No.15/2025 on the file of the civil judge (Senior Division), Narsapur, West Godavari District as illegal, unlawful, unconstitutional and violation of the principals of natural justice and contrary to Article 300-A of the constitution of India.

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 4th and respondents not to interfere with the civil dispute in O.S.No. 15/2025 on the file of the civil judge (Senior Division), Narsapur, West Godavari District pending disposal of the Writ Petition and pass

Counsel for the Petitioners: SARASCHANDRA BABU JAKKAMSETTY
Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

APHC010334932026



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026
PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 17907 OF 2026

Between:

1. S. Narasinga Rao, S/o Gurumurthy(late) Aged 42 yrs , Occ Advocate,
D.NO. 13-41 A Chepallupada , Bheemunipatnam , Visakhapatnam District.

...Petitioner

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep., by its Principal Secretary (Home)
Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravathi.522237

2. The Commissioner of Police, Visakhapatnam City.530026

3. The Station House Officer, Bheemunipatnam Police Station
Bheemunipatnam, Visakhapatnam District. 531163

4. Garikina Nooka Raju, S/o(late) Garikina Appa Rao Aged 44 yrs, D.NO.13-
12, Mangamaripeta Chepaluppada Post, Bheemunipatnam Visakhapatnam
City 531163

...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 or Order or Direction more particularly one in the nature of a Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondent Police in continuously harassing the Petitioner to attend before the Police Station in connection with the Civil Dispute in O.S.No.75/2026 on the file of XII Additional District Judge, Visakhapatnam where in one document filed i.e., Family Member Certificate obtained through Mee Seva dt.09/11/2015 where in the legal heirs names mentioned as Ascending Order in connection with the same threatening to remove the document from the Civil Suit or else they

wants to register a Criminal Case at the instance of the unofficial respondent all illegal, unlawful, it is nothing but interfering into the Civil Dispute, Violation of Principles of Natural justice. Violation of Article 14,19,21 of the Constitution of India, consequently to direct the respondent Police not to interfere Into the Petitioner as well as unofficial respondent Civil Suit in O.S.No.75/2026 on the file of XII Additional District Judge, Visakhapatnam till the finalization as per the law by Allowing the Writ Petition 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 Police not to call for or harass the petitioner, including interference into the Civil Dispute pending finalization in O.S.No.75/2026 on the file of XII Additional District Judge, Visakhapatnam, including by taking any Coercive Steps pending disposal of the main Writ Petition and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner: R SIVA SAI SWARUP
Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

APHC010449722026



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 24704 OF 2026

Between:

1. DAMERA SRI SATYA AKARSH, S/o. Satish Kumar, Aged about 30 years,
Occ Business, R/o. D.No.60-23-A/1, Siddhartha Nagar, S.B.I. Colony,
Vijayawada City, NTR District, Andhra Pradesh. Cell 8179877123.

...Petitioner

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Home
Department, Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravati, Andhra Pradesh - 522238

2. The Director General of Police, Andhra Pradesh, Mangalagiri, Andhra
Pradesh - 522503.

3. The Superintendent of Police, NTR District, Andhra Pradesh - 520002.

4. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Tiruvuru Sub-Division, NTR District,
Andhra Pradesh - 521235.

5. The Station House Officer, A. Konduru Police Station, A. Konduru Mandal,
NTR District, Andhra Pradesh - 521226.

6. Balumuri Naga Padma, W/o. Late Venkateshwar Rao, Aged about 58 years, Occ Business, R/o. D.No.2-4, A-Konduru Village and Mandal, NTR District, Andhra Pradesh - 521226.

7. Boppana Srinivasa Rao, S/o. Venkateshwar Rao, Aged about 50 years, Occ Business, Rio. D.No.11-68, Poranki, Vijayawada City, NTR District - 521137.

8. Vemulapally Naga Laxmi, W/o. Ravindranadh Tagore, Aged about 57 years, Occ Business, R/o. D.No.1-125, Penamaluru, Kankipadu, NTR District - 521139.

9. Balumuri Divya Naga Laxmi, W/o. V.V.S. Srinivas, Aged about 42 years, Occ Business, Rio. D.No.4-31/C, B.S. Nagar, Peraigudem Village, Aswaraopet Mandal, Bhadradi Kothagudem District, Telangana State 507301

...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 Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action/inaction of Respondent Nos.3 to 5, particularly Respondent No.5 Station House Officer, A. Konduru Police Station, in a) failing to receive my complaint/information regarding the alleged high-handed, threatening and unlawful acts of Respondent Nos.7 to 9 b) failing to examine and consider the video clips/electronic material produced by me c) repeatedly calling me to A. Konduru Police Station at the instance of Respondent Nos.7 to 9 in connection with the pending civil dispute d) failing to

act fairly and impartially upon the complaints/information furnished by me and e) permitting the police machinery to be used for exerting pressure upon me in relation to O.S. No.53 of 2026 as illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and contrary to the public duty of the police authorities, and consequently direct Respondent Nos.3 to 5 to a)Receive and consider complaint/information and all supporting material, including the video clips, in accordance with law b) conduct an impartial enquiry into the allegations of high-handed and unlawful conduct made against Respondent Nos.7 to 9 c) take appropriate action in accordance with law if any cognizable offence is disclosed d) refrain from repeatedly calling or harassing me in relation to the pending civil dispute except in accordance with law and for a lawful purpose e) not permit Respondent Nos.7 to 9 to misuse the police machinery for pressurising or intimidating me f) ensure that no unlawful interference, threat, intimidation or attempt at dispossession of me is permitted and, if any such conduct amounts to an offence, take action strictly in accordance with law g) maintain complete neutrality between the private respondents and me h) ensure that the pending civil proceedings in O.S. No.53 of 2026 and the interim order passed therein are not circumvented or frustrated through police intervention

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 direct Respondent Nos.3 to 5:a) not to harass or repeatedly call me to A.

Konduru Police Station in relation to the subject matter of O.S. No.53 of 2026 except in accordance with law;b) not to interfere with my possession or civil rights in the plaint schedule property;c) to maintain complete neutrality between me and Respondent Nos.6 to 9;d) to consider my complaint and video evidence and take appropriate action in accordance with law upon any independent cognizable offence disclosed; and e) to ensure that there is no threat, intimidation, unlawful interference or attempt at dispossession by Respondent Nos.6 to 9, pending adjudication of the civil proceedings.

Counsel for the Petitioner: DEVARAM SRIHARI

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

APHC010357612026



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026
PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 19334 OF 2026

Between:

1. Kunchala Srinivasu, S/o (Late) Venkateswarlu, Hindu, aged about 42 years, Rio D.No. 26-44-97, New Door No. Venkata Ramana Colony, 4th Lane, Pradesh-522002 ... 90-13, Ward No. 26, Guntur, Guntur District, Andhra Petitioner

...Petitioner

AND

1. The Principal Secretary to Government, Home Department, Secretariat Buildings, Velagapudi, Amaravati, Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh- 522238.
2. The Superintendent of Police, Guntur District, Office of the Superintendent of Police, Collectorate Compound, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh- 522001.
3. The Station House Officer, Lalapet Police Station, Lalapet, Guntur City, Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh- 522002.
4. Lakkavajjala Venkata Mallikarjuna Rao, S/o Srirammurthy, Hindu, aged about 68 years, R/o Flat No. 101, Sai Srinivasa Luxuries, Jaipuri Colony, Opp. Kalyan Laxmi Gardens, Nagole, Hyderabad, Ranga Reddy District, Telangana- 500068.

...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 topleased to issue an order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the police officials of Lalapet Police Station, Guntur City (Respondent No. 3) in threatening the Petitioner to vacate the schedule property and interfering in the pending civil

suits, namely O.S. No. 789/2025 and O.S. No. 1391/2025, despite the matters being subjudice before the competent civil courts at Guntur, as illegal, arbitrary, high-handed and violative of principles of natural justice as well as violative of the Petitioners fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 14, 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and Consequently, this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to direct the Respondents, more particularly Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, to forthwith refrain from interfering with the peaceful possession of the Petitioner, not to threaten or coerce the Petitioner or his family members to vacate the schedule property, and not to involve in civil disputes as the civil suits of O.S. No. 789/2025 and O.S. No. 1391/2025, are pending before the competent Civil courts at guntur and further Directing Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to act strictly in accordance with law and not to entertain any complaint from Respondent No. 4 for eviction without a ifnal court decree and due process of law. Grant any other relief as this Honble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case

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 Respondents, more particularly Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, not to interfere in the pending civil disputes (O.S. No. 789/2025 and O.S. No. 1391/2025) before the competent civil courts at Guntur and not to threaten, coerce or pressurise the Petitioner or his family members to vacate the schedule property and also direct the police authorities not to entertain any complaint from Respondent No. 4 for eviction without a final court decree and due process of law, and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner: KARTHIKSIDDARTHA SALADI

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

APHC010351452026



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026
PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 18796 OF 2026

Between:

1. Punugupati Anjaneyulu, S/o. Venkata Ramaiah, aged about 56 years R/o. Peda Gogulapalli, C.S.Puram, Markapuram District.
2. Punugupati Ravindra,, S/o. Peda Anjaneyulu, about about 37 years, R/o. Peda Gogulapalli, C.S.Puram, Markapuram District.
3. Miriyam Venkateswarlu,, S/o. Peda Guravaiah, aged about 60 years, R/o. Peda Gogulapalli, C.S.Puram, Markiapuram District.
4. Miriyam Babu,, S/o. yenkateswarlu, aged about 39 years, R/o. Peda Gogulapalli, C.S.Puram, Markapuram District.

...Petitioners

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Prindipal Secretary, Home Department, Velagppudi, Amaravathi, Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh.522001
2. The Superintendent of Police, Markapuram District.523001
3. The Station House Officer, Pamuru, Pamuru Village, Kanigiri Mandal, Markapuram District.
4. Chilamkuri Ramaiah, S/o. vbnkata Reddy, aged about 45 years, Peda Gogulapalli, C.S.Puram, Markapuram 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 in the nature of a

writ of mandamus, declaring the action of Respondent No. 3 in harassing the petitioners by summoning to the police station and interfering with the civil dispute pending between the petitioners and Respondent No. 4, and further intimidating them with false criminal implications, on failure of arriving to a settlement, as illegal, arbitrary, high-handed, and violative of Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondent no.3 to not to interfere in any manner with respect to the civil dispute pending before the competent civil court in O.S. No. 219/2024 on the file of the Junior Civil Judge Court, Kanigiri, and to ensure that the petitioners 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.3 to not to summon and harass the petitioners to the respondent no.3 station with respect to the civil dispute pending before the competent civil court in O.S. No. 219/2024 on the file of the Junior Civil Judge Court, Kanigiri, pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioners: PILLIX LAW FIRM

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

APHC010348492026



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 18759 OF 2026

Between:

1. Boreddy Bhaskar Reddy, S/o. B. Chow Reddy, Aged about 32 years, Occ
Agriculturist, R/o D.N0.2-25-D, Pedda Kottala Village, Nandyal Mandal and
District 518502

...Petitioner

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep.by its Principal Secretary,Home
Department, Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravati,522237

2. The Superintendent of Police, Nandyal District, Nandyal, A.P-518501.

3. The Circle Inspector, Nandyal Taluk Town PS, Nandyal, A.P-518501.

4. The Station House Officer, Nandyal Taluk Town PS, Nandyal, A.P-518501.

5. Boreddy Chow Reddy, S/o. B.Chinnapu Reddy, Aged about 62 years,Occ
Agriculturist, R/o. H.No.2-250, Pedda Kottala Village, Nandyal Mandal and
District, A.P-518501.

6. Boreddy Rajasekhar Reddy, S/o.B.Chow Reddy, Aged about 34 years, S/o. Occ Agriculturist, R/o. H.No. 2-250, Pedda Kottala Village, Nandyal Mandal and District, A.P-518501.

7. Boyilla Rami Reddy, S/o B.Basi Reddy, Aged about 67years,Occ Agriculturist, R/o. Raythunagaram Village, Nandyal Mandal and District,A.P-518501.

8. Dasari Ranganayakulu, S/o. Dasari Pandu, Aged about 50 years, Occ Agriculturist, R/o.H.No.28-1242,Nivarthi Puram, Nandyal Town and District.518501

9. Thiruveedhi Bhagya Lakshmi, W/o T.Venkataratnam, Aged about 44 years, Occ House wife, R/o.H.No.2-290,291, N.K.Road, Nandyal Town and District.518501

10. KamiSetty Sravani, W/o. Sri Ramachandra Gupta, Aged about 49 years, Occ. Housewife, R/o.H.No.1-38, Yerrabalem Village, Cumbum Mandal, Prakasam District. 523333

...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 Mandamus, declaring the action of respondents 3 and 4 in interfering in the civil dispute between the petitioner and respondents 5 to 10, by summoning the petitioner to the police station, threatening him to withdraw O.S.No.451 of 2025 and to vacate the plaint-schedule property, and attempting to meddle with his possession, as illegal, arbitrary, without jurisdiction and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct respondents not to interfere, in any manner whatsoever, with the petitioners possession and enjoyment of the plaint-schedule property, not to summon or call the petitioner to the police station in relation to the said civil dispute, not to coerce or compel him to withdraw suit or to vacate the property and not to meddle or intervene in any manner in the civil dispute between the petitioner and respondents 5 to 10, which is the subject-matter of above suit and 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 respondents 3 and 4 not to interfere with the petitioner's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaint-schedule property and not to summon or call the petitioner to the police station and not to coerce him to withdraw O.S.No.451 of 2025 or to vacate the plaint-schedule property or intervene in any manner in the civil dispute between the petitioner and respondents 5 to 10 which is the subject-matter of suit pending before the Court of the Principal Civil Judge (Junior Division), Nandyal and Pass

Counsel for the Petitioner: B S REDDY

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM
WRIT PETITION NOS: 5488, 27041 & 31424 of 2024, 1160 & 35726 of 2025
and 15259, 16946, 17441, 17907, 24704, 19334, 18796 & 18759 of 2026

COMMON ORDER:

As the issue involved in all the Writ Petitions is one and the same and in view of the consent expressed by both the parties, the batch of Writ Petitions is disposed of by way of common order.

2. Overall sum and substance of the instant *lis* is that when the matter is *sub judice* before competent Civil Courts, appropriate forums, interference of police in respect of the very same subject properties *inter-se* parties is under challenge in these Writ Petitions, mainly on the ground that the police have no jurisdiction to interdict or determine the civil rights of the parties.

3. Learned counsels for the petitioners draws the attention of this Court to the relevant provisions enunciated in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and the Police Act, 1861. Substantiating their assertions, learned counsels also relied on ***J.Lakshmi @ Lakshamma & Another Vs. Commissioner of Police & Others***¹ and ***G.B.C.Raj Gopal Vs. The Government of Andhra Pradesh, Represented by the Principal Secretary***².

4. Sri P.Ajay Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home, while denying the averments made in the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petitions, submitted that the respondent-police never called the petitioners to the respective police stations and that they will not interfere with the civil

¹ 2004 (2) ALD Cr.477

² 2014 SCC OnLine AP 322

disputes *inter se* parties, unless any crime is registered for commission of any cognizable offences. Learned Assistant Government Pleader fairly brought to the notice of this Court the categorical instructions (dealing with land disputes) of the Director General of Police, Andhra Pradesh vide No.76/DGP's Peshi/2025 dated 24.10.2025 to the concerned police personnel. He also read out the relevant paras of the same, for the sake of a comprehensive view, which are extracted hereunder:

It has been observed that land-related disputes, both private and government, are increasingly being reported across several districts. These disputes are often escalating into law and order situations, leading to communal tension, violent altercations, and property damage. Even minor disagreements over land boundaries or ownership are, in some instances, turning into major conflicts due to political, caste, or community dimensions being injected into the issue.

xxx

4. *All Unit Officers and Range Officers are hereby directed to evolve a comprehensive district-wise strategy to identify, monitor, and resolve land dispute-related issues in coordination with the Revenue and Judicial authorities. The following course of action shall be strictly adhered to:*

(a) Preventive Measures under Law:

1. *In cases where law and order disturbances are likely, the police must initiate preventive proceedings under BNS in coordination with revenue authorities and, where necessary, bind over the parties under preventive sections.*
2. *The local police should immediately bring the matter to the notice of the concerned Executive Magistrate and ensure that prohibitory orders are issued promptly to prevent breach of peace.*
3. *In every such case, the local CI/SDPO must personally supervise the situation until the dispute is brought under control or referred to competent authorities.*

(b) Coordination with Revenue & Judicial Authorities:

1. *In cases involving civil ownership or title disputes, police should not take sides or interfere in the civil adjudication process.*
2. *However, close coordination with Tahsildars, RDOs, and Revenue Divisional Officers must be maintained to ensure timely demarcation, eviction, and enforcement of legal orders.*

3. *The District Collector and SP/CP shall jointly review sensitive land disputes at least once every month to assess potential flashpoints.*

(c) Registration of Criminal Cases:

1. *When criminal intent or violence is evident—such as trespass, cheating, forgery, assault, or criminal conspiracy—appropriate criminal cases shall be registered under relevant sections of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.*
2. *Particular attention should be given to repeat offenders and politically motivated land grabbers, who often exploit technicalities in the civil process to encroach upon land or disturb peace.*
3. *Ensure speedy investigation and charge-sheet filing in such cases to deter others from similar behaviour.*

(d) Monitoring & Accountability:

1. *District SB shall prepare and maintain a Land Dispute Risk Register, classifying disputes as Low / Medium / High Risk based on communal sensitivity, violence potential, and local influence factors.*
2. *The SP/CP shall personally monitor the top 10 high-risk disputes in the district and submit a monthly status report to PHQ through the Range DIG concerned.*
3. *Any negligence, delay, or failure to act preventively leading to violence will be viewed seriously, and disciplinary action will be initiated against the responsible officers.*
4. *It is reiterated that Police do not play any role in deciding ownership or possession, which falls exclusively under the purview of civil courts and revenue authorities. However, police intervention becomes mandatory when there is a threat to public peace, life, or property, or when criminal acts arise from such disputes. Officers must therefore strike the right balance between legality and prevention, ensuring that law and order is preserved without overstepping jurisdictional limits.*
5. *The above instructions shall be implemented in letter and spirit, and Range DIGs shall review compliance during their district inspections and monthly law & order reviews.*

Emphasis supplied

5. Learned counsels for the unofficial respondents submits that in view of the ground realities and criminality attached to the disputes *inter se* parties, they rightly approached police personnel and, as such, there are no procedural or jurisdictional irregularities. However, they have not disputed the factum of pendency of civil suit between the parties.

6. In light of the above facts and circumstances of the case, the core common issue to be determined in the present batch of cases is:

Whether the police have any jurisdictional powers to interfere or determine the civil rights of the parties, more particularly, pending the disputes before competent Civil Courts or statutory forums or not?

7. Heard learned counsels for the petitioners and learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home appearing on behalf of the official Respondent-State, as well as learned counsels for the unofficial respondents and perused the entire material available on record.

8. Police have a statutory duty to maintain law and order and preserve public peace and safety. They are primarily responsible for preventing crime, controlling situations that may lead to breach of the peace, protecting the lives and properties of people, and taking lawful action against persons who engage in violence, threats, intimidation, or other unlawful activities. The police may also take necessary preventive measures when there is anticipation of disturbance or danger to public order. Thus, the essential role of Police is to prevent unlawful acts, protect people and property, maintain peace, and ensure that individuals are able to carry on their lawful activities, without unlawful interference.

9. In fact, when the statutory powers are conferred on the particular wing, more particularly, judicial/quasi-judicial forums and the respective forums have seized the matter and dealt with the matter as per the prescribed procedure,

no other executive authority, who is not vested with such adjudicatory powers under the relevant statutory framework, cannot encroach upon or usurp the powers of such exclusively vested jurisdictional powers of the competent forums and deal with the rights of parties contrary to the fundamental principles of law, if anything, going contrary to the prescribed tenets amounts to acting without jurisdiction under the principles of law.

10. In the scheme of Constitution of India, the duty to resolve civil disputes is entrusted to the judiciary. No such power is empowered to the Police. Interference in a pending civil dispute or a potential civil dispute between two citizens or two groups is not within the province of the police. Furthermore, if a cognizable offence is reported to the police even as per the enunciated scheme of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, (for brevity “BNSS 2023”), it is the duty of the police to register and investigate the crime to unravel the truth and submit a report by way of charge sheet or final report to the concerned jurisdictional Court only. Thereafter, it is the duty of the competent Court to adjudicate the case after providing reasonable opportunity to the parties as well by following statutory procedures and to reach its logical conclusions, as per its jurisdictional sphere. It is well settled that judicial power is a sovereign power which can be conferred only by constitutional as well as statutory schemes, and it cannot be taken away or assumed *Suo motu* by any other authority on its own, which is contrary to the well-settled legal principles.

11. Coming to the instant issue, the Police Department, which has no jurisdiction to determine civil rights *inter se* parties, seeking to take over the

powers vested in another statutory forum may lead to multifarious problems and anomalies, not only affecting the functioning of said police wing, but also prejudicing the rights of the parties, furthermore, to the societal interests too.

12. It is apt to note that Courts in our Indian context generally would not assume the role of an investigative agency, unless it is required, so why, because it is in the orbit of an investigative agency empowered with fundamental duties in their domain.

13. Interesting facet in this context is that, evidently, the executive magisterial authorities such as Mandal Level, Sub-Divisional Level, District Level officers, though they are empowered under the provisions of the BNSS, 2023 & BNS, 2023 as well as other Legislative regimes to initiate statutory measures, such as maintaining public peace and security and also preventing breach of law, the said executive powers also came to a halt when the competent Judicial Forums, such as Civil Courts, seize the subject in issue, *inter se* parties.

14. For better understanding, Section 164 BNSS, 2023 (corresponding to Section 145 of CrPC, 1973) deals with disputes relating to land, water, buildings or their boundaries which are likely to cause a breach of peace. Under this provision, where a dispute exists about the actual possession of the disputed property, the Executive Magistrate may initiate appropriate proceedings in accordance with law and require the concerned parties to appear before him and submit their respective claims, along with such

material as they may seek to rely upon, regarding the actual possession of the property in question. An Executive Magistrate primarily determines who is in actual possession of the property, rather than adjudicating the ultimate question of ownership or title. Where necessary, particularly when the possession cannot be ascertained, or there is an immediate likelihood of breach of peace, the property may be attached, until the competent Court determines the rights of the parties. The primary purpose of Section 164 BNSS, 2023 is to prevent disputes from escalating into violence and to maintain peace and public order. Thus, even as per the provisions of BNSS, 2023 also, when competent Judicial authority seizes the dispute *inter-se* parties over the very same subject property, executive magisterial powers come to be very minimal.

15. In light of the above perception, it is relevant to note some of the expressions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India which are as under:

In ***Mohd. Abid and Others v. Ravi Naresh and Others***³, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that where the competent Civil Court has already seized itself of the dispute concerning the same property, the proceedings under Sections 145 and 146 CrPC, 1973 cannot be permitted to continue in parallel. Determination of the *inter se* rights of the parties relating to title or possession ultimately falls within the jurisdiction of the Civil Court, whereas the proceedings before the

³2022 SCC OnLine SC 2416

Executive Magistrate are intended only as a preventive measure to avert a breach of peace.

“4. Once the Civil Court is seized of the matter, it goes without saying that the proceedings under Section 145/146 Cr.P.C., cannot proceed and must come to an end. The inter-se rights of the parties regarding title or possession are eventually to be determined by the Civil Court.”

16. In ***Mohd Shakir v. State of UP***⁴, Apex Court held that even while dropping proceedings under Section 145 Cr.P.C., an executive Magistrate cannot make observations on the respective rights in respect of the subject property, as it is the exclusive domain of the Civil Court.

17. Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, while interpreting the statutory regime in respect of the powers of the Courts in ***Shailesh Kumar Singh alias Shailesh R.Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh & Ors.***⁵, held that while exercising jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India or Section 482 CrPC, the Court must examine the allegations in the FIR and the material on record to ascertain whether the ingredients of any criminal offence are disclosed. The criminal process cannot be permitted to be used as a means for recovery of a monetary claim arising out of a commercial dispute, and quashing of criminal proceedings cannot be made subject to payment of a specified amount to the complainant. Where the dispute is essentially civil or commercial in nature, the parties are at liberty to pursue the appropriate civil remedy.

⁴2022 SCC OnLine SC 2389

⁵ 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1462

18. In this context, it is trite to quote the specific observations of the Apex Court in *Shailesh Kumar Singh's case (supra)*, which reads are as under:

"11. The entire case is squarely covered by a recent pronouncement of this Court in the case of "Delhi Race Club (1940) Limited v. State of Uttar Pradesh", (2024) 10 SCC 690. In the said decision, the entire law as to what constitutes cheating and criminal breach of trust respectively has been exhaustively explained. It appears that this very decision was relied upon by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner before the High Court. However, instead of looking into the matter on its own merits, the High Court thought fit to direct the petitioner to go for mediation and that too by making payment of Rs. 25,00,000/- to the 4th respondent as a condition precedent. We fail to understand, why the High Court should undertake such exercise. The High Court may either allow the petition saying that no offence is disclosed or may reject the petition saying that no case for quashing is made out. Why should the High Court make an attempt to help the complainant to recover the amount due and payable by the accused. It is for the Civil Court or Commercial Court as the case may be to look into in a suit that may be filed for recovery of money or in any other proceedings, be it under the Arbitration Act, 1996 or under the provisions of the IB Code, 2016.

12. xxx

13. Money cannot be recovered, more particularly, in a civil dispute between the parties by filing a First Information Report and seeking the help of the Police. This amounts to abuse of process of law."

Thus, from the above vivid opinions of the Apex Court, it is too well settled that the police have no Jurisdiction to meddle with civil rights *inter se* parties.

19. It is relevant to note that when the police interfere with the rights of the parties without any lawful or jurisdictional authority, such interference can have serious and far-reaching consequences, not only for larger societal interests but also the very functioning of the police and the discharge of their statutory duties. For instance, if a Station House Officer of a prominent and sensitive police station, along with his subordinate personnel, engages in resolving civil disputes based on his own whims and fancies, without any

jurisdiction conferred upon them, it would affect all the stakeholders in the civil disputes and give rise to far more complications. Ultimately, such conduct would also adversely affect the maintenance of law and order and the effective discharge of their own statutory policing duties also which is not good for the societal interest as well as the police department's interest too.

20. In the above scenario, it is pertinent to note different expressions of the Constitutional Courts while dealing with the rights of police in interfering with the civil rights of the parties. In ***J. Lakshmi @ Lakshamma and Anr. vs. Commissioner of Police***⁶, the High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad reiterated that the police authorities have no jurisdiction to interfere with the disputes or to compel the parties to arrive at a settlement through police intervention. Determination of civil rights and disputes relating to title or possession purely falls within the domain of the Civil Court, and police cannot assume such adjudicatory powers. The High Court, while observing that police cannot interfere in civil disputes, observed as under:

“4. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that when the dispute is purely of civil nature, the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution cannot be exercised. The Supreme Court also repeatedly laid down that when the dispute between the two citizens is of civil nature and no crime is registered, police have no jurisdiction to interfere in the civil dispute. Further, when there is a civil litigation either before the court of law or before the tribunal, the police have no jurisdiction to interfere in the civil disputes. Further, when there is a civil litigation either before a court of law or before a tribunal, the police cannot interfere and even if a complaint is made in relation to such dispute pending in a civil court, the citizens have to be advised to resolve the dispute through a duly constituted court of law.

In the scheme of the Constitution of India, the duty to resolve civil disputes is entrusted to judiciary. Police have no such power. Any

⁶2004 SCC OnLine AP 29

interference by police in a pending civil dispute or a potential civil dispute between two citizens or two groups of citizens is not within the province of the police. Furthermore, if a cognizable offence is reported to the police, it is the duty of the police to register the crime under Section 154 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Cr.P.C.) and take up investigation immediately. In a given case, even if a civil dispute, to say a land dispute, is pending before a civil court and if the quarrel between the two warring parties has a potential of resulting in a law and order problem posing threat to the society at large, the police can always take up the case only after registering the crime under Section 154 Cr.P.C. Without registering the crime and without any reason the police cannot interfere.”

21. In **G.B.C. Raj Gopal vs. The Government of A.P., Rep. by the Principal Secretary (2014)**⁷, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, at Hyderabad, while stating that the police have no jurisdiction to adjudicate civil or property disputes *inter se*, parties opined that:

“51. The function of resolving civil disputes is entrusted to the judiciary. Police officers lack jurisdiction to interfere in civil/property disputes between two citizens. Even in criminal case, their role is limited to the registration of complaints and causing investigation. The power to adjudge whether or not an accused is guilty of having committed a criminal offence, and to convict and sentence him therefor, is vested exclusively in the judicial branch of the State. Judicial power cannot be exercised by agencies outside the judicial orbit and, where there is no legislative foundation for exercise of judicial power by a forum, it has no legal capacity to entertain requests for adjudication. Judicial power is a facet of sovereign power and can be conferred only by a Statute or by a Statutory instrument. It cannot be assumed suo motu. No authority may exercise adjudicatory powers absent a conferment of such powers by Statutory instruments. The coercive power of the State may not be employed to adjudicate disputes. (M/s. Janathaem Industries Ltd., rep., by its Public Relations Officer M.S. Ganesan, Vijayawada v. The District Collector, Krishna district at Vijayawada).”

22. Thus, once the statutory powers that are conferred on the Executive Authorities itself come into the plunge with the intervention of Civil Courts, the very fundamental, foundational fact that the police authorities have not been

⁷2014 SCC OnLine AP 322

conferred adjudicatory powers under the statutory scheme either in terms of provisions of BNS, 2023 or BNSS, 2023 nor under police laws, police interference with the civil disputes of parties is *per-se* illegal, arbitrary and absolutely without jurisdiction; moreover, it is diametrically opposed to the constitutional vistas.

23. It is also well settled that where the legal position on an issue stands authoritatively settled by the Supreme Court, it is not necessary to multiply authorities by referring to a catena of judgments reiterating the same proposition. In furtherance of the above settled proposition, this Court is not venturing into referring similar dictums.

24. Yet another facet is that, even as per the data records, though Andhra Pradesh police population is approximately 166.18 per one lakh population, however, as per the United Nations recommendations, a Police-Population ratio of 222 per lakh is required for apt policing. Hence, overall perception also suggests that police, extending their limited forces, infrastructural facilities and professional powers towards non-Jurisdictional arenas, may leads to futile exercise except for the “unjust enrichment” of some of police personnel's interests, which is *per se* illegal and unconstitutional and also against the letter and spirit of our “Indian Constitutional” tenets, as well as antithesis to “***Salus populi suprema lex esto***” (Let the welfare of the people be the supreme law).

25. Recently, in ***Rohit Chaturvedi v. State of Uttarakhand***⁸, the Supreme Court of India reiterated that executive action having a bearing upon the personal liberty of an individual must satisfy the constitutional requirement of fairness and non-arbitrariness under Article 21 of the Constitution and held that the exercise of executive discretion affecting liberty cannot be allowed to remain uncanalised and must be based on relevant and rational considerations. Apex Court also emphasized that deprivation of liberty must have a lawful, rational and constitutionally sustainable basis and cannot rest upon a cryptic or unexplained executive decision.

26. In this context, it is apt to note some of the ground realities and problems that existed in our contemporary society, from the backdrop of the colonial phase too. In fact, Sri Upendra Baxi, a renowned law scholar, observed that “the colonial police survived decolonization; it simply changed masters”, highlighting the continuity of the colonial policing system even after India attained independence. The police structure, methods and legal framework largely continued to reflect the colonial model, mainly based on the Police Act, 1861, which was primarily designed to maintain order, control the population and protect the interests of the ruling authority, rather than to function as a citizen-oriented service. Thus, although the British rulers were replaced by an elected Indian government, the basic institutional character of the police remained substantially unchanged. Hence, all the stakeholders contribute their respective support to change the overall existing police

⁸2026 SCC Online SC 865

structures from the colonial phase to people-centric policing in the larger interest of modern India and turns into Democratic policing, which means a system of policing in which the police exercise their powers within the limits of law, remain accountable to constitutional and democratic institutions, and respond to the legitimate needs and rights of the people.

27. In considered opinion of this Court, after perceiving the overall facts and circumstances of the core issue in the present batch of cases, police are entrusted with the responsibility of protecting life, liberty, rights and public order, but they are not an authority above the people. Police powers are conferred by law and must be exercised fairly, reasonably and proportionately. Thus, the police must act as guardians of the constitutional principles, rather than as rulers exercising unchecked authority over citizens. It is significant to note the dictum of the Supreme Court held in ***Prakash Singh vs. Union of India***,⁹ which plays a pivotal role in our Indian police reforms. Apex Court, through its thoughtful consideration, formulated seven (07) directives in the Prakash Singh's case so as to strengthen the existing policing into more professional, accountable and independent from unnecessary interference from other quarters. Eminent legal personality Sri Solij Sorabjee, who was the chairman of the Committee, contributed to formulate the Model Police Act, 2006 (MPA), which was a model draft legislation prepared by the Government of India and circulated to the respective State Governments for enact or amend the existing Police legislations. It seems only some State Governments

⁹ 2006 (8) SCC 1

have passed their local Police laws inspired by the MPA, 2006. It is also apt to note that subsequently, the Department-Related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Home Affairs also forwarded its Report mentioning subsequent developments on police training, modernization, and reforms by taking note of previous Police Reforms Committees etc.

28. In essence, when the police interfere with the rights of parties, without any lawful or jurisdictional authority, such interference can have serious and far-reaching consequences, not only on larger societal interests but also the very functioning of the police too. Hence, clear boundaries of functions of law enforcement agencies and judicial functions should be maintained.

29. All in all, from the overall facts and circumstances coupled with statutory regime as well as well-settled legal principles by the Supreme Court and other constitutional Courts, it is unequivocally settled that the police have no jurisdiction to adjudicate upon or determine the civil rights of parties *inter se*. The determination of civil rights is within the domain of Civil Courts and other legislative-conferred forums only. Accordingly, the core issue is answered.

30. Accordingly, these Writ Petitions are disposed of as under:

- i. Respondent-Police are directed not to interfere or adjudicate or determine or settle the civil rights of the parties, without any legal cause.

ii. Respondent-Police personnel shall follow the guidelines issued by the Director General of Police, Andhra Pradesh, *vide* Communication No.76/DGP's Peshi/2025 dated 24.10.2025 in its *stricto sensu*.

iii. Likewise, it shall be open to the respective parties to work out their legal remedies before the appropriate Civil Courts or competent forums, in terms of the law.

iv. It is hereby clarified that, if the police make out any cognizable offences against the petitioners, they are at liberty to proceed in accordance with the law;

There shall be no order as to costs.

Interlocutory applications, if any, pending shall stand closed.

JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

Date: 30.09.2026
PSA

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

**WRIT PETITION NOS: 5488, 27041 & 31424 of 2024, 1160 & 35726 of 2025
and 15259, 16946, 17441, 17907, 24704, 19334, 18796 & 18759 of 2026**

Date: 30.09.2026

PSA