

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.V. SESA SAI

WRIT PETITION No.27567 OF 2015

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the following relief:

“to issue an order / direction or any appropriate writ more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of 3rd respondent herein in calling in the petitioner to his office frequently pursuant to Notice No:40/Petition/CCS, DD/HYD, Dtd.21-05-2015 and making him to sit in the office from morning to evening and pressurizing the petitioner to subscribe his signatures on the documents already prepared without disclosing the contents thereof in order to settle the civil disputes with the unofficial respondents herein and on failure to do so threatening the petitioner to implicate in false criminal cases as arbitrary, illegal, unjust and in violation of Article 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents herein not to harass and call the petitioner to the office of the 3rd respondent in order to settle the civil disputes with the unofficial respondents therein and pass such other order/s as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.”

2. When the matter is called today, a letter dated 05.09.2015 addressed by the Assistant Commissioner of Police, WCO Team – VII & VIII, CCS, DD, Hyderabad, addressed to the learned Government Pleader for Home and Law, Government of Telangana, Hyderabad, has been placed on record by the learned Government Pleader for Home and the same reads as under:

“1) That, in response to the Para No: 2 it is baseless allegations made by the petitioner that basing on the complaint of Sri. R. Ramesh Raju s/o. R. Narsimha Raju, aged 42 yrs, Occ: Business, c/o. Mallappa Raju, Venkateswara Gardens (Function Hall), Opposite to Pet Basheerbad police station, Jeedimetla, Medchal Road,

R.R. District, I have served notice to the petitioner on 21.5.2015 and called him to my office on only one occasion to verify the veracity of allegation in the petition, except that there was no other intention.

Upon which the petitioner attended my office for one time and after causing enquiries he left the office, thereafter he never called or summoned to my office.

2) That, in response to the Paras No: 3 86 4 – Not applicable to 3rd Respondent.

3) That, in response to the Para No: 5 it is to submit that on receipt of complaint from Sri. R. Ramesh Raju s/o. R. Narsimha Raju, aged 42 yrs, Occ: Business, c/o. Mallappa Raju, Venkateswara Gardens (Function Hall), Opposite to Pet Basheerbad police station, Jeedimetla, Medchal Road, R.R. District, I have called the petitioner Sri. Vanga Sudheer Reddy to my office by issuing a notice for only verifying the veracity of allegations made against him, and after causing enquiries the petitioner left my office on the same day, but not settling the dispute arose between the complainant and petitioner.

4) That, in response to the Para No: 6, it is submit that the allegations are vague and baseless that I have not pressurized the petitioner to settle the issue arose between the petitioner and respondents. And I never warned the petitioner, but I listened his grievances patiently. It is also false that I have threatened the petitioner to implicate him in false criminal cases if he did not settle the issue with respondents.

5) That, in response to the Para No: 7, it is to submit that the petitioner never asked to show the complaint. It is further submitted that on only one occasion the petitioner was called to my office, wherein explained the contents of the complaint and after causing enquiries the petitioner left my office, but I never forced him to sit in my office till late night as alleged in the petition. And it is also vague and baseless allegation that I have called him to my office twice or thrice in a week for all these months. And it is also baseless allegation that not to disclose the above to anybody outside the office including the higher officials, failing which he will face the consequences. I never tried and pressurized the petitioner to settle the

issue with the respondents and in order to verify the veracity of contents of complaint, I called the petitioner to my office for enquiry. It is vague and baseless allegation that myself nor my staff visited his house frequently to pick him up. I never pressurised the petitioner to sign on blank and type documents in favour of respondents when he visited my office and I never threatened him to implicate in false cases.

It is further submitted that I never called the petitioner to my office frequently and never harassed him to sign on any documents in favour of respondents, except one time by issuing notice and I never made the petitioner to sit in my office hour together as alleged to settle the issue between the petitioner and respondents, moreover the petitioner made all vague and baseless allegations. In order to avoid further course of action, the petitioner filed this Writ Petition and misguiding the Hon'ble court."

3. On noticing the said submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner requested this court to dispose of the writ petition by recording the said written submissions.

4. In view of the above, writ petition stands disposed of, by recording the written submissions dated 05.09.2015 of the Assistant Commissioner of Police, WCO Team – VII & VIII, CCS, DD, Hyderabad.

5. Miscellaneous petitions pending consideration, if any, in the Writ Petition shall stand closed in consequence. No order as to costs.

A.V.SESHA SAI, J

07th September, 2015
ss