

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE TENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN
PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

WRIT PETITION No.38712 of 2014

BETWEEN

Pothula Narayana.

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Home Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR. K.V. BHANU PRASAD

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME (TG)

The Court made the following:

-
-
-

ORDER:

Heard.

2. Present writ petition is filed by the petitioner contending that respondents 2 and 3 are interfering with the civil dispute, which is subject matter of O.S.No.1018 of 2005 before the IV Additional Senior Civil Judge, L.B. Nagar, with respect to land admeasuring Ac.1.33 guntas in Sy.No.83/E at Nagireddypalli village, Maheshwaram Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

3. Instructions received by the learned Assistant Government Pleader, however, show that one K. Shiva Prasad, respondent No.5 herein, lodged a complaint with the Maheshwaram Police Station on 11.12.2014 against some persons including the petitioner and based on the allegation of trespass and demolition of fencing, a case in Cr.No.290 of 2014 was registered on 12.12.2014. Petitioner figures as A1 in the said crime. It is stated that except registration of the aforesaid crime, respondents 2 and 3 have nothing to do with the civil dispute between the parties and that respondents 2 and 3 are only concerned with the investigation of the said crime where presence of the petitioner is required. It is also stated that appropriate action will be taken by following due procedure contemplated under law.

4. Since it is specifically stated that respondents 2 and 3 are not interfering with the civil dispute and are not concerned with the same, it is appropriate that respondents 2 and 3 confine themselves to the investigation of the aforesaid crime, in accordance with law and file an appropriate final report/charge sheet before the jurisdictional Magistrate expeditiously.

The writ petition is disposed of. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

February 10, 2015
DSK