

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH
(SPECIAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTIETH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN
PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

WRIT PETITION No.3183 of 2015

BETWEEN

K.G. Basavaraju and two others.

... PETITIONERS

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Secretary, Home Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioners: MR. PERI PRABHAKAR

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following:

-
-
-

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed alleging that at the instance of respondent No.6, respondents 1 to 5, in particular respondents 4 and 5 are pressurizing the petitioner to settle the civil dispute pending in O.S.No.6 of 2013 and O.S.No.4 of 2014 before the Additional District Judge, Hindupur, relating to partition of properties among the properties.

2. Learned Assistant Government Pleader has received instructions, which state that respondent No.6 approached the Additional Superintendent of Police, Anantapur on 09.01.2015 complaining against the petitioners and other family members that they are not cooperating with him to sell part of the land and as such, he wanted intervention by the police. The Station House Officer, Hindupur I Town Police Station, appears to have examined the said request and on finding that this matter is civil in nature, advised respondent No.6 to approach the civil Court for adjudication of the joint family property issues. It is also stated that on the complaint of one Reddappagari Ramachandra Reddy a case in Cr.No.61 of 2013 was registered against the petitioner wherein the petitioner secured anticipatory bail from the Additional Sessions Judge, Hindupur in CrI.MP.No.488 of 2013 dated 29.04.2013 and thereafter, the petitioner approached this Court in CrIP.No.4423 of 2013 wherein interim stay was granted.

3. In view of that, respondents 4 and 5 state that they have never interfered with the civil dispute of the petitioner and even respondent No.6 was advised to approach the civil Court. In view of that, therefore, the apprehension of the petitioner is not justified.

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

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

March 20, 2015
DSK