APHC010362442026

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

THURSDAY, THE 12th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE SUNITHA GANDHAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 19502/2026

Between:

1. BRAMHASAMUDRAM CHINNA ANJINA REDDY, S/O B.S. NARASA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS, OCC BUSINESS, R/O. 3-C, CHALLAPALLI VILLAGE, SOMADEPALLI, SRI SATHYA SAI DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT, AP SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT-522238.
2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, PUTTAPARTHY, SRI SATHYA SAI DISTRICT-515134.
3. THE DY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, PENUKONDA, SRI SATHYA SAI DISTRICT-515134.
4. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, SOMADEPALLI POLICE STATION, SRI SATHYA SAI DISTRICT-515110.

...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 a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of a WRIT OF MANDAMUS or any other appropriate Writ, Order or Direction declaring the order passed by the Respondents No. 2 and 3 herein vide opening and maintaining of Rowdy Sheetviz., Rowdy Sheet No. 79 and directing the 4th Respondent to open rowdy sheet/History Sheet against the

Petitioner is arbitrary, illegal, malafide and violation of Article 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents herein to close the Rowdy Sheet No. 79, opened against the Petitioner and further direct not to interfere with the life and personal liberty of the Petitioner and pass

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 For the reasons stated in the accompanying affidavit in support of the writ petition, it is further humbly prayed that this Honourable Court may to direct the Respondents herein not to interfere with the life and liberty of the Petitioner by calling him to the Police Station, pursuant to opening of rowdy sheet by the 4‘^ Respondent herein, pending disposal of the Writ Petition before this Hon’ble Court and to pass s

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. O UDAYA KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE SUNITHA GANDHAM

WRIT PETITION No.19502 OF 2026

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking a direction to the respondents to close Rowdy Sheet No.79 opened against the petitioner by respondent No.4 and not to interfere with his life and personal liberty.

2. As per the version of the petitioner, he is a resident of Challapalli Village, Somandepalli, Sri Sathya Sai District, a case in Crime No.21 of 2016 was registered against him and others by the SHO, Somandepalli Police Station for the offences punishable under Sections 307, 450 and 109 of the Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred to as "the Code") and at the culmination of trial, he was acquitted in S.C. No.449 of 2017 vide judgment dated 09.04.2019. Further, a rowdy sheet was opened against him at Somandepalli Police Station and the police have been unnecessarily summoning him to the Police Station and detaining him for hours together. It is also alleged that his photographs are being displayed alongside those of pickpockets and other rowdy elements, causing him harassment and humiliation. Further, the petitioner has been suffering from serious health issues requiring lifelong medical check-ups and except Crime No.21 of 2016, he has no other criminal antecedents. Finally, respondent No.4 had no authority to open rowdy sheet against him and that the impugned action is unsustainable under Standing Order No.601 of the A.P. Police Manual.

3. The learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home filed counter-affidavit contending that though the petitioner acquitted in S.C. No.449 of 2017, he has scant respect for law, and three bind over cases are registered in M.C NO.5 of 2019, 24 of 2019 and 88 of 2020 against the petitioner for maintaining good behavior, and in order to curb and prevent the petitioner's alleged unlawful activities in the vicinity of Somandepalli Police Station, Sri Sathya Sai District, the Station House Officer, Somandepalli Police Station, Penukonda Circle, opened a rowdy sheet against the petitioner after obtaining

proceedings from the Sub-Divisional Police Officer, Penukonda, dated 02.11.2017, vide C.No.733/Genl/SDPO-P/2017, and the Station House Officer has continued to maintain the rowdy sheet to keep proper watch over the petitioner's movements, and the same is reviewed from time to time. It is contended that, in terms of Standing Orders Nos.601 and 602(2) of the A.P. Police Manual, the rowdy sheet is required to be maintained and continued, subject to review in accordance with the said Standing Orders.

4. Heard Sri O. Udaya Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Sri R. Mallikarjuna, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No.4 opened the rowdy sheet without following the Police Standing Orders, particularly Standing Order No.601 of the A.P. Police Manual, and that the proceedings opening the rowdy sheet are contrary to the applicable Standing Orders. It is contended that the petitioner is not a habitual offender, has not been convicted in any criminal case and is not involved in any other offence apart from the cases referred to in the writ petition and counter-affidavit. According to the learned counsel, the rowdy sheet was opened without adhering to the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, thereby infringing the petitioner's rights.

6. Per contra, the learned Assistant Government Pleader submits that the rowdy sheet was opened to curb and prevent the petitioner's unlawful activities after obtaining the requisite permission.

7. The record and the counter-affidavit disclose that Crime No.21 of 2016 was registered against the petitioner for the offences punishable under Sections 307, 450 and 109 IPC and at the culmination of trial, petitioner was acquitted in S.C. No.449 of 2017 vide judgment dated 09.04.2019. Admittedly, except that case, no other case is presently pending against the petitioner. The rowdy sheet was opened on 02.11.2017 vide proceedings No.C.No.733/Genl/SDPO-P/2017 and has been renewing from time to time. In

this regard, it is to be noted that in **B. Satyanarayana Reddy v. State of Andhra Pradesh**[1], it was held that, under Police Standing Order No.742, inclusion of a person's name in a rowdy sheet requires material showing that such person habitually commits or abets offences involving a breach of peace and a solitary instance involving a breach of peace, by itself, is not sufficient to justify such inclusion, and, in ***Puttagunta Pasi v. Commissioner of Police, Vijayawada***[2], a Division Bench of this Court held that opening rowdy sheets in a routine manner against persons who are not habitual offenders is impermissible. The Division Bench further observed as follows:

> "...it is clear that rowdy sheets cannot be opened against any individual in a casual and mechanical manner. Dubbing a person as a habitual offender and opening a rowdy sheet is not sufficient. On the other hand, due care and caution shall be taken by the Police before characterising a person as a rowdy. The important element that has to be seen in the acts of an offender is whether the acts so committed by a person will have a tendency to disturb public peace and tranquillity."

8. It is apposite to mention the relevant Standing Order No.601 of the A.P. Police Manual and the same is reproduced as follows:

i. Persons, who habitually commit, attempt to commit or abet the commission of offences involving a breach of the peace, disturbances to public order and security.

ii. Persons bound over under Sections 106, 107, 108 (1) and 110 (e) and (g) of Cr.P.C.

iii. Persons who have been convicted more than once in two consecutive years under Sections 59 and 70 of the Hyderabad city police Act or under Section 3, Clause 12 of the A.P Town Nuisances Act.

iv. Persons who habitually tease women and girls and pass indecent remarks including offences u/s 354-A, B, C and 354 D IPC.

v. Persons who have been charge sheeted under the offence of Rape (376, 376 A, C, D, E)

vi. Persons who have been charge sheeted under the offences of POCSO Act, 2012 and Acid Attacks (326 A and 326 B of IPC)

---

[1] 2004 (1) ALD Crl. 50
[2] (1998) 3 ALT 55

vii. Rowdy sheets for the rowdies residing one police station area but found frequenting the other Police Stations area, can be maintained at all such police stations.

viii. Persons who intimidate by threats or use of physical violence or other unlawful means to part with movable or immovable properties or in the habit of collecting money by extortion from shopkeepers, traders and other residence including “loan sharks”.

ix. Persons who incite, instigate and participate in communal/ caste or political riots.

x. Persons detained under the AP prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Dacoits, Drug Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders and Land Grabbers Act, 1986 for a period of6 months or more.

xi. Persons on whom charge sheets filed under the offence of assault on public servants, under Arms Act and such other offences punishable with imprisonment of 2 years or more.

xii. Persons on whom charge sheets filed under the offence of murder and attempt to murder (302 and 307 IPC).

xiii. Persons on whom charge sheets filed under the offence of chain snatching.

xiv. Persons who are convicted under the Representation of People Act,1951 for rigging, carrying away, damaging ballot paper, boxes and polling mațerial.

9. And, Standing Order No.602 of the A.P. Police Manual provides that merely because a suspect/rowdy having a history sheet has not figured as an accused in any case during the previous five years after the last case in which he was involved, the Superintendent of Police/Deputy Commissioner of Police/Commissioner of Police is not precluded from continuing the history sheet, if such officer is of the considered view that the person’s activities are prejudicial to the maintenance of public order, affect peace and tranquillity in the area, or the victims are not coming forward to lodge complaints against him due to threats from him.

10. It is not in dispute that, apart from the cases referred to above, the petitioner is not an accused in any other case and has not been convicted in any other case. Standing Order No.601 of the A.P. Police Manual specifies the categories of persons against whom a rowdy sheet may be opened, subject to the conditions contained therein. A reading of the said Standing

Order shows that it identifies specified categories of persons against whom a rowdy sheet may be opened, subject to the requirements prescribed therein. These categories include persons habitually involved in offences affecting public peace and order, persons involved in specified serious offences and persons whose activities fall within the other enumerated categories.

11. The record and the counter-affidavit disclose that there are no pending cases against the petitioner. Therefore, the mere registration of a criminal case, particularly when that case ended in acquittal, cannot, in the absence of supporting material establishing habitual criminal activity or showing that the petitioner falls within any specific category under Standing Order No.601, justify the continued branding of the petitioner as a rowdy. Added to it, bind over cases also registered in the year 2019 and 2020 and the said period of maintaining good behavior has already been completed.

12. In the facts and circumstances of the case, and in the light of the aforesaid decisions and the applicable Standing Orders, this Court is of the considered view that the respondents have not placed any material to show that the petitioner falls within any category contemplated by Standing Order No.601 or that he is habitually involved in criminal activity. The general assertion that the rowdy sheet was opened to curb the petitioner's alleged unlawful activities, without supporting material demonstrating habitual conduct or any other applicable ground under the Standing Orders, is insufficient to justify its opening or continuation. The filing of a charge sheet in one criminal case, by itself, does not establish that the petitioner is a habitual offender or that the requirements of the Standing Orders are satisfied. Consequently, the opening and continuation of the rowdy sheet cannot be sustained and amount to an arbitrary exercise of police power. The impugned action is, therefore, liable to be set aside.

13. **In the result,** the writ petition is allowed. The respondents are directed to close the rowdy sheet maintained in the name of the petitioner. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

_____

SUNITHA GANDHAM, J

Date:12.11.2026
knl