

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

\* \* \* \*

**WRIT PETITION No.25597 OF 2012**

-

Between:

Tadepalli Lavanya

.. Petitioner

And

The Superintendent of Police,  
West Godavari District, Eluru, and others.

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 04-08-2015

**SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:**

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR**

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers Yes/No  
may be allowed to see the Judgment?

2. Whether the copies of judgment may be Yes/No

marked to Law Reporters/Journals

3. Whether Their Lordship wish to

see the fair copy of the Judgment? Yes/No

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR**

**WRIT PETITION No.25597 of 2012**

**ORDER:**

-

The grievance of the petitioner in this case was that the police authorities were not executing the non-bailable warrant dated 30.12.2011 issued by the learned II Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Kovvur, in M.C.No.14 of 2009 and the non-bailable warrant dated 27.06.2012 issued by the learned Special Judicial Magistrate of First Class (Excise), Eluru, in C.C.No.108 of 2008.

Relying on the written instructions dated 30.07.2015 furnished by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Women Police Station, Eluru, the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home informed this Court that the non-bailable warrant dated 27.06.2012 issued in C.C.No.108 of 2008 on the file of the learned Special Judicial Magistrate of First Class (Excise), Eluru, was executed in September, 2012 and upon obtaining the

P.T. warrant from the said Court, the accused was also produced before the learned II Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Kovvur, in M.C.No.14 of 2009. The Deputy Superintendent of Police further stated that no separate warrant was received in M.C.No.14 of 2009 but, in any event, the accused was produced before the said Court.

Sri B.V.S.S. Balakrishna Ranjit, learned counsel for the petitioner, would however contend that even thereafter the accused failed to appear before the Court in the aforesaid two cases and that separate non-bailable warrants were again issued against him. His complaint is that those non-bailable warrants have not been executed.

However, the prayer in this writ petition is in the context of two specific non-bailable warrants issued by the competent criminal courts. So far as the said warrants are concerned, it is clear that the cause does not survive in relation thereto.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. This order shall however not preclude the petitioner from taking appropriate measures in accordance with law in the event she has any grievance as to subsequent developments.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall also stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

---

**JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR**

4<sup>th</sup> August, 2015

IBL