

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT

W.P.No.36147 of 2017

ORDER:-

Heard Mr C. Sharan Reddy, counsel for petitioner and the Assistant Government Pleader (Home) for respondents 1 to 3.

The Sub Divisional Police Officer, who filed the counter affidavit, having regard to the circumstances of the case has stated as follows:

“It is submitted that it is fact that the petitioner has made a representation dated 29.06.2017 to the Superintendent of Police, W.G.District, Eluru, with a request to close the rowdy sheet against him. The same will be considered by the Sub-Divisional Police Officer, Narasapuram, at the time of review/renewal of rowdy sheet in December, 2017.”

Having considered the averments in the affidavit and the counter affidavit, this Court is of the view that ends of justice are met by directing the respondents to take note of the circumstances as on date while reviewing the rowdy sheet challenged in the writ petition and also the age of the petitioner. The petitioner is at liberty to file explanation/representation within two weeks from today by enclosing copy of this order. This Court has no reason to doubt that as and when such explanation/representation is filed by the petitioner, the same is examined in the light of the law laid down by this Court in W.P.No.4688 of 2012 which was disposed of on 16.03.2017 and in the judgments reported in

Sunkara Satyanarayana v. State of Andhra Pradesh¹ and B. Satyanarayana Reddy v. State of Andhra Pradesh².

The petitioner is given liberty to make additional representation to 2nd respondent-the Superintendent of Police, W.G.District, Eluru and the same shall be considered by him within four (04) weeks, thereafter.

With the above observation, the writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous Petitions, if any pending, stand closed.

07.12.2017
dv



S.V. BHATT, J

¹ 2000(1) ALD (CrL.) 117 (AP)

² 2004(1) ALD (CrL.) 38 = 2004(2) ALT (CrL.) 115