APHC010585352026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE 4th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE KIRANMAYEE MANDAVA

WRIT PETITION NO: 32073 OF 2026

Between:

1. Kasireddy Vajra Bhaskar Reddy,, S/o. Krishna Reddy, Aged about 48 years, Occ Business, Residing at D.No.1-113, Adapala Street, Kadiri, Sri Sathya Sai District.515591

...Petitioner

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Home Department, Secretariat Buildings, Velagapudi Village, Amaravati.522237

2. The Andhra Pradesh State Election Commission, Rep. by its Secretary, Vijayawada, NTR District.520001

3. The District Collector and District Election Authority, Sri Sathya Sai District, Puttaparthi.515134

4. The Director General of Police, AP Police Head Quarters, Mangalagiri, Guntur District.522503

5. The Superintendent of Police, Sri Sathya Sai District, Puttaparthi.515134

6. The SubDivisional Police Officer, Kadiri, Sri Sathya Sai District.515591

7. The Station House Officer, Kadiri Rural Police Station, Kadiri, Sri Sathya Sai District.515591

8. The Station House Officer, Gandlapenta Police Station, Gandlapenta, Sri Sathya Sal District.515591

...Respondents

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 more particularly in the form of Writ of Mandamus declaring the proceedings of the 6th respondent in Rc.No.138/SDPO-KDR/2026 dated 29.10.2026, rejecting the request of the petitioner for personal security, and the consequential failure of the respondents 2, 4 and 5 to provide adequate police protection to the petitioner pursuant to the representations dated 18.10.2026, 25.10.2026, 28.10.2026 and 29.10.2026, asperse illegal, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India and contrary to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No.37476 of 2026 dated 27.10.2026 and the constitutional mandate of free and fair elections, and set aside the said proceedings, and consequently direct the respondents 4 to 8 to positively provide adequate police protection to the petitioner, including personal security officers, until the completion of the election process to the Zilla Praja Parishad, Sri Sathya Sai District, including the poll on 05.11.2026, counting, declaration of results and the election of the Chairperson, to arrange police bandobast for the public meetings, rallies and campaign programmes of the petitioner and to take prompt action on any complaint made by the petitioner or his supporters, and further direct the respondents 2 and 3 to take all necessary measures to ensure the conduct of a free and fair election in Kadiri Division, Sri Sathya Sai District

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 direct the respondents 4 to 8 to forthwith provide adequate police protection to the petitioner, including personal security officers and police bandobast for

his campaign programmes, during the ongoing elections to the Zilla Praja Parishad, Sri Sathya Sai District, including the poll on 05.11.2026, counting and the election of the Chairperson, so as to ensure a free and fair election,

Counsel for the Petitioner: VMR LEGAL

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following Order:

Heard Sri Venkatesh B. Reddy, learned counsel appearing from the office of M/s VMR Legal, learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Government Pleader for Home and Sri Ajay Kumar Kanaparthi, learned counsel representing Sri N. Ashwani Kumar, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent Nos.2 & 3.

2. The grievance of the petitioner in the instant Writ Petition is against the proceedings of the respondent No.6 refusing to provide personal security to the petitioner despite specifically bringing to the notice of the police authorities the grave and imminent threat to life, police have refused to provide protection. Aggrieved by the same, the instant Writ Petition is filed.

3. It is contended that in W.P.No.31715 of 2026 dated 29-10-2026, this Court had earlier directed the respondent No.2 to pass appropriate orders on the representation of the petitioner dated 28-10-2026. Pursuant to the direction of this Court, the respondent No.6 passed the impugned order, dated 29-10-2026, observing that as and when the petitioner faces difficulty

during conducting of election campaign or any apprehension regarding safety, the same shall be informed to the Police Control Room by dialing **100/112** or to the concerned Station House Officer (SHO) of the local Police Station. Observing thus the representation of the petitioner was rejected stating that entire police force had been deployed on various bandobast duties in connection with the local body elections and there is no sufficient strength to provide any security to the petitioner.

4. When the matter has been taken up for consideration today, learned Government Pleader for Home has placed before the Court a copy of written remarks received by him in the case. A perusal of the same would reflect as under:

> *"2. Specific factual position:*
>
> *The petitioner has no criminal cases registered against him.*
>
> *The petitioner has no faction background.*
>
> *The petitioner has not been subjected to any attack or assault during his election canvassing in the Kadiri ZPTC territorial constituency, namely Kadiri Rural Mandal. No such incident has been reported to the jurisdictional police or brought to notice in the enquiry."*

5. The respondent No.6 – Sub Divisional Police Officer did not consider any of the submissions of the petitioner. The respondent No.6 did not even observe as to whether the petitioner had made out reasonable case for providing police security. Without referring to any of the submissions made by the petitioner, the order impugned was passed stating that entire police

was deployed under various bandobast duties, whereas in the parawise remarks, the respondent No.6 stated several other facts which does not reflect from the impugned order stating that an enquiry was conducted and no specific information establishing threat to the petitioner's life or safety from any person or that no previous attack had happened to the petitioner. The perception of the petitioner was treated as apprehension and police protection was refused as the alleged enquiry did not establish specific threat warranting providing personal security.

6. As seen from the impugned order, none of the reasons as stated in the Para wise remarks are reflected from the impugned order. The refusal to extend police protection was without due consideration of the facts indicated in the representation. If the facts stated by the petitioner were not genuine or if the belief of the petitioner was not found to be bonafide, the respondents' authorities were always at liberty to reject the claim. However the respondents did not assign any of those reasons, except to state that lack of sufficient strength of police personnel. Having regard to the same, the impugned order is set aside and the respondent Nos.5 & 6 are directed to forthwith provide police security to the petitioner so as to enable him to participate in the polling scheduled on 05-11-2026 and on the date scheduled for counting of the ballots.

7. With the above observation, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, all pending miscellaneous applications shall stand closed.

JUSTICE KIRANMAYEE MANDAVA

Dated: 04-11-2026

Note: Issue CC today
B/o.

MSI

39

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE KIRANMAYEE MANDAVA

WRIT PETITION NO: 32073 OF 2026

Dated: 04-11-2026

Note: Issue CC today
B/o.

MSI