APHC010315432026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3604]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE 6th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE SUNITHA GANDHAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 16757/2026

Between:

1. CHILAMALA SRINIVASULU, S/O VENKATASUBBAIAH AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS, D.NO.4/361 G.V.SATHRAM VILLAGE, NANDYALAMPETA POST, MYDUKAR MANDALAM KADAPA 516172
2. GOSETTI VENUGOPAL, S/O VENKATRAMAIAH AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS, D.NO. 20-10-A SRINAGARAM, NANDYAL ROAD, MYDUKURU TOWN KADAPA DISTRICT 516172
3. SRI RACHAPALLE SURESH KUMAR, S/O R.RAMAIAH AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS R/O D.NO.9-310, DEVAKI REDDY STREET, CHINTAPARTHY VILLAGE AND POST VAYALPAD/VALMIKIPURAM MANDALAM, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT 517277

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOME, VELAGAPUDI VILLAGE AMARAVATHI MANDAL GUNTUR DISTRICT
2. THE SUPERINTENDENT, OF POLICE ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT AT MADANAPALLE 517325
3. THE CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, 11 TOWN PS MADANAPALLE ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT 517325
4. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT AT MADANAPALLE 517325
5. THE TAHSILDAR, MADANAPALLE MANDALAM MADANAPALLE 517325 ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT
6. THE MADANAPALLE, MUNICIPALITY MADANAPALLE REPTD BY ITS MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONER 517325
7. THE APSEB EMPLOYEES UNION, (APSEEU-327) REGD NO. 327,

O/O DIVISIONAL ELECTRICAL ENGINEER, APSPDCL, CTM ROAD, MADANAPALLE, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY, S. GOPAL REDDY, EMPL.D.NO. 6431, LINE INSPECTOR, MADANAPALLE, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT.

8. APSEB EMPLOYEES UNION, (APSEEU-327), MADANAPALLE BY ITS DIVISIONAL SECRETARY, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY V. CHINNAPPA, S/O VENKATAPPA, AGED ABOUT 82 YEARS, RETD EMPLOYEE, RIO D. NO. 16/644-A-3, BASINIKONDA COLONY, MADANAPALLE, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT.

9. KONDUPALLE RAMACHANDRA, S/O LATE K.GOPALU, AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS, RESIDING AT 10-15, GANDLAPALLE, H/O KAMBHAMVARIPALLE, SADUM MANDAL, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT.

10. KONDUPALLE BALASUBRAMANYAM, S/O K. RAMACHANDRA, AGED 38 YEARS, RESIDING AT D.NO.3/174, GOLLAPALLE, MADANAPALLE, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT.

11. KONDUPALLE OBULESU, S/O KONDUPALLE RAMACHANDRA, AGED 34 YEARS, RESIDING AT D.NO.3-174, GOLLAPALLE, MADANAPALLE, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT.

12. PALAVALI SATHYA REDDY, S/O P. VENKATRAMANA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS, RESIDING AT TARIGONDA RACHAPALLE VILLAGE, GURRAMKONDA MANDAL, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT, PRESENTLY RESIDING AT D.NO. 17-91-1-11, RAJIV NAGAR, MADANAPALLE, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT.

13. BIDDAIA SAHADEVA REDDY, S/O NOT KNOWN, AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,R/O NEAR GANGAMMA TEMPLE SBI COLONY, MADANAPALLE TOWN ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT 517325

14. G GIRISHAM, S/O NOT KNOWN, AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS, NEAR OLD ABUDAYA SCHOOL SHANAWAZ STREET MADANAPALLE TOWN ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that, in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue an order, direction or writ, more particularly one in the nature of mandamus, declaring the action of respondent Nos.2 and 3 in interfering with the civil litigation pending before various forums between the writ petitioners and the unofficial respondents/ respondent Nos.8 to 14, insisting that the petitioners settle the dispute with the unofficial respondents, and providing police aid and support to respondent Nos.8 to 14 for laying/forming a layout in the land belonging to the petitioners in Sy.No.509/4, to an extent of

Ac.2.00 cents out of Ac.5.26 cents, situated at Bandameedakammapalle Village, Madanapalle Mandal, Annamayya District, and insisting upon the petitioners to agree to the terms and conditions of respondent Nos.8 to 14, as illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional; and consequently, to direct respondent Nos.2 and 3 not to provide police aid to unofficial respondent Nos.8 to 14 for forming a layout in the said land, not to insist upon the petitioners to enter into any settlement with respondent Nos.8 to 14, and to provide police protection to the petitioners in respect of the said land, and pass such other order or orders as this Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that, in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct respondent Nos.2 and 3 not to provide police aid to unofficial respondent Nos.8 to 14 for forming a layout in the land in Sy.No.509/4, to an extent of Ac.2.00 cents out of Ac.5.26 cents, situated at Bandameedakammapalle Village, Madanapalle Mandal, Annamayya District; not to insist upon the writ petitioners to enter into any settlement with respondent Nos.8 to 14; and further, to direct respondent Nos.2 and 3 to provide police protection to the petitioners in respect of the said land, and pass such other order or orders as this Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

IA NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that, in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to implead the petitioners/proposed respondent Nos.15 to 47, who are stated to be subsequent purchasers from the APSEB Employees Union, as respondent Nos.15 to 47 in W.P.No.16757 of 2026, and pass such other order or orders as this Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. S S BHATT

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR HOME
2. T Nagaraja

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE SUNITHA GANDHAM

WRIT PETITION No: 16757 OF 2026

ORDER:

This petition is filed by the petitioners seeking a direction to respondent Nos.2 and 3/Police not to insist upon the writ petitioners to enter into a settlement with respondent Nos.8 to 14 and to provide police protection to the petitioners for enjoying the land admeasuring Ac.2.00 cents in Sy.No.509/4 of Bandameedakammapalle Village, Madanapalle Mandal, Annamayya District.

2. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home has filed the written instructions of the Station House Officer, Madanapalle II Town Police Station, stating that there are civil disputes between the petitioners and respondent Nos.8 to 14 and that, in view of the said civil disputes, respondent Nos.2 and 3/Police would not interfere in the civil disputes between the parties.

3. Sri O. Udaya Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners, submitted that the petitioners have filed I.A.No.2 of 2026 seeking to implead 33 persons as respondent Nos.15 to 47 in the main petition, stating that they are subsequent purchasers as well as absolute owners of the subject land.

4. Admittedly, there are civil disputes between the petitioners, respondent Nos.8 to 14 and third parties in respect of the subject land. It is well settled that the police cannot interfere in disputes which are purely civil in nature. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has repeatedly held that, where the dispute is purely civil in nature, the extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India ought not to be invoked for adjudicating such disputes. When a dispute between citizens is essentially civil in nature and no crime is registered, the police have no jurisdiction to interfere with the civil dispute or to compel the parties to arrive at a settlement. The duty to adjudicate civil rights is entrusted to the competent civil courts, and the police have no authority to assume such adjudicatory functions or to facilitate one party in obtaining an advantage over the other in a pending or prospective civil dispute.

5. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home fairly submitted that the police would not interfere in the civil disputes pending between the petitioners, respondent Nos.8 to 14 and third parties. Having considered the undertaking given on behalf of the police that they will not interfere in the civil disputes, except in accordance with law, this Court is of the considered view that the writ petition can be disposed of by recording the said undertaking.

6. The second prayer of the petitioners, seeking a direction to the police to provide police protection, cannot be granted in the present writ petition, particularly when the rights of the parties in respect of the subject land are the subject matter of civil disputes and are required to be adjudicated by the competent civil court. Granting such police protection in the circumstances would, in substance, amount to facilitating one party in a civil dispute without adjudicating the rival claims of the parties. It is, therefore, appropriate to leave the parties to work out their remedies before the competent civil court or any other appropriate authority in accordance with law. Needless to say, the petitioners, respondent Nos.8 to 14 and the third parties claiming rights over the subject land are at liberty to approach the competent forum for adjudication of their respective rights.

7. **In the result**, this Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent Nos.2 and 3/Police not to interfere with the civil disputes pending between the petitioners, respondent Nos.8 to 14 and third parties, except in accordance with law. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

SUNITHA GANDHAM, J

Dt:06.10.2026

Note:
Issue C.C. by 13.10.2026
B/o:-Scs

57

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE SUNITHA GANDHAM

WRIT PETITION No: 16757 OF 2026

Date: 06.10.2026

Issue C.C. by 13.10.2026

B/o:-Scs