

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA
PRADESH

* * *

WRIT PETITION No. 32157 of 2011

BETWEEN

Mala Maremma

... PETITIONER

AND

The Principal Secretary (Home), Government of Andhra Pradesh,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

Date of Order pronounced: 22.07.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-
-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgments? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? | Yes/No |
| 3. Whether their Lordship wish to see the
fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

ORDER:-

The grievance of the petitioner in this case was that the Sub-Inspector of Police, Aiza Police Station, Mahaboobnagar District, and his sub-ordinates were interfering with her and her family members' lives. The specific complaint of the petitioner was that the police authorities were interfering with the activities of her husband, Mala Gudise Ramulu, notwithstanding the interim stay granted by this court in Crl.M.P.No.8148 of 2011 in Crl.P.No.7717 of 2011 dated 05.09.2011. By the said order, this court granted stay of all further proceedings in Crime No.77 of 2011 on the file of Aiza Police Station.

2. The Sub-Inspector of Police, Aiza Police Station, Mahaboobnagar District, filed a counter affidavit stating that upon the complaint made by one Mala Govindamma, Crime No.77 of 2011 was registered on the file of Aiza Police Station under Section 509 IPC. The husband of the petitioner herein was the sole accused in the said crime. While the investigation was under process, the husband of the petitioner approached this court and obtained stay of further proceedings.

The Sub-Inspector denied the allegation of the petitioner that he was summoning her husband to the police station or interfering with the life and liberty of the petitioner or her family members. He further stated that pursuant to the orders passed by this court, he had stopped the investigation process. The Sub-Inspector concluded the counter by stating that the petitioner and her other family members were not necessary parties as only her husband was shown as the accused in Crime No.77 of 2011 and that he never harassed the petitioner or her family members at any point of time.

3. As the husband of the petitioner was arrayed as the sole accused in Crime No.77 of 2011, the police may have to undertake investigation of the said case in the event the stay granted by this Court is vacated in future. Needless to state, the police would be bound to abide by the due procedure laid down by law while undertaking such exercise.

Making this position clear, the writ petition is closed. Pending miscellaneous petitions shall stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

July 22, 2015
Lmv

SANJAY KUMAR, J