

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

MONDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF FEBRUARY  
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN

PRESENT

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR**

**WRIT PETITION No.3970 of 2015**

**BETWEEN**

G.Ravi Kumar

**... PETITIONER**

**AND**

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue, A.P. Secretariat Building, Hyderabad and others.

**...RESPONDENTS**

**The Court made the following:**

-  
-

**ORDER:**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Advocate General.

2. Petitioner states that presently he is sitting MLA representing Addanki Assembly Constituency. The grievance of the petitioner in this writ petition is that though he has been provided security by the State, which is 2+2 at present, the same is required to be upgraded to 4+4. Petitioner has given various instances in the affidavit justifying the said request and it is stated that petitioner has already made a representation dated 13.01.2015 to the Director General of Police, State of Andhra Pradesh. Alleging inaction on the

part of respondent No.2, the present writ petition is filed.

3. Learned Advocate General submits that the competent authority, which is empowered to consider the said representation is the Additional Director General of Police (Intelligence), who is also head of the Security Review Committee, and if an appropriate representation is filed by the petitioner before the said competent authority, the same would be considered.

4. Petitioner has already filed a representation before respondent No.2 on 13.01.2015, copy whereof is appended to this writ petition, Ex.P1. Hence, instead of asking the petitioner to make another representation to the Additional Director General of Police, it would be appropriate to direct respondent No.2 to make available the said representation of the petitioner dated 13.01.2015 to the competent authority, as referred to above, and thereafter the Additional Director of General of Police shall consider the said representation, in accordance with law, and take appropriate decision in the matter at his earliest.

With the above direction, 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.

February 23, 2015  
**LMV**

---

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J