

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT

WRIT PETITION No.8333 of 2011

ORDER:

Heard Sri C.Raghu learned counsel for petitioner and the Assistant Government Pleader for Home.

2. The petitioner complains that respondents 2, 3 and 7 at the instance of the 4th respondent, who is a retired additional Superintendent of Police, Guntur, are interfering with the civil dispute without a case pending investigation against the petitioner.

3. The petitioner referred to several instances attempting interference by respondents in the civil dispute between petitioner and his brother/ 6th respondent.

4. The 7th respondent filed counter affidavit explaining in great detail the circumstances under which the police have to investigate into the FIR filed by petitioner etc.

5. On the alleged interference in civil dispute, the 7th respondent states as follows:-

“6. In reply to para No.14 of the affidavit, it is submitted that the allegation of the petitioner that this respondent is acting at the instance of the 4th respondent who is retired as Additional Superintendent of Police and who is none other than the father-in-law of the 6th respondent is false and hence the same is denied. The allegation of the petitioner that this respondent has sent a clear message that if they do not settle the issue with the 6th respondent this respondent would see his end is also false and hence the same is denied.

7. It is pertinent to submit that the dispute among the petitioner, his brother (6th respondent) and the father-in-law of the 6th respondent (shown as 4th respondent) is predominantly civil in nature. I submit that the 6th respondent who is the brother of the petitioner herein never approached this respondent and lodged any complaint against the petitioner herein. I submit that this respondent never acted to the tunes of the 4th respondent-Retd.Addl.Suptd. of Police. I submit that there is no necessity for this respondent to threaten the petitioner nor asked him to settle the dispute with his brother-6th respondent. I submit that to wreak vengeance against his own brother, the petitioner made baseless allegations against this respondent. I submit that this respondent never threatened the petitioner nor asked him to come down to this office and settle the issue with the 4th and 6th respondent. I submit that all the allegations made in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition against this respondent are exaggerated, false, frivolous and baseless and hence the same are denied.”

6. The counter affidavit was filed in the year 2011. There is no rejoinder or reply to the stand of the 7th respondent.

7. The statement of the 7th respondent is placed on record and the writ petition is disposed of accordingly, as no further order is necessary. No order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending, shall stand closed.

S. V. BHATT, J

Dt: 20-01-2017
Prv