



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

[3521]

TUESDAY, THE THIRTY FIRST DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 7979/2026

Between:

1. MARAMREDDY REDDAIAH, S/O MARAMREDDY NARASIMHULU, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, OCCUPATION- RUNNING BOYS GREEN HOUSE HOSTEL R/O CHAKRAMPETA, PONDALURU, PENAGALURU, PONDALUR, CUDDAPAH , ANDHRA PRADESH - 516128.
2. MARAMREDDY SIVA ,, S/O MARAMREDDY BUJJIAH, WORKING IN HOSTEL, AGED ABOUT 20 YEARS, 1/29, SINGANAMALA, SINGANAMALA, PO. SINGAREDDYPALLI, PENAGALUR, CUDDAPAH DISTRICT, STATE. ANDHRA PRADESH - 516127.
3. KONERU NARASIMHULU,, S/O (LATE) KONERU RAMAIAH, AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS. FARMER R/O D.NO.1-17, SINGANAMALA, SINGANAMALA, PO SINGAREDDYPALLI, PENAGALUR, CUDDAPAH DISTRICT, STATE ANDHRA PRADESH - 516127.
4. KONERU VAMSI MOHAN,, S/O KONERU NARASIMHULU, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, R/O D.NO.1-16, SINGANAMALA, SINGANAMALA, PO. SINGAREDDYPALLI, PENAGALUR, CUDDAPAH DISTRICT STATE ANDHRA PRADESH - 516127.
5. KONERU VISHNUVARDHAN,, S/O KONERU NARASIMHULU, AGED ABOUT 17 YEARS, MINOR, REPRESENTED BY HIS NATURAL GUARDIAN, KONERU NARASIMHULU, S/O (LATE) KONERU RAMAIAH, R/O D.NO.1-16, SINGANAMALA, SINGANAMALA, PO. SINGAREDDYPALLI, PENAGALUR, CUDDAPAH DISTRICT, STATE. ANDHRA PRADESH - 516127.

...PETITIONER(S)**AND**

- 1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI.
- 2.THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, DISTRICT POLICE OFFICE, RAYACHOTY, ANNAMAYA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH-516269.
- 3.THE STATE HOUSE OFFICER, MANNURU UPS POLICE STATION, PXAJAMPET MANDAL, ANNAMAYA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH-516115

...RESPONDENT(S):**Counsel for the Petitioner(S):**

- 1.TURAGA MK PRANEETHA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

- 1.GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following:**ORDER:**

The Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following relief:-

“...to a Issue a writ or direction more particularly one in the nature of a WRIT OF MANDAMUS 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 restraining Respondents particularly Respondent Nos 2 and 3 from harassing or summoning the Petitioners or their family members without following due process of law b Direct the Respondent Police to act strictly in accordance with law and not to take any coercive steps against the Petitioners in the absence of registration of an FIR and without complying with the mandatory procedural safeguards under law and pass such order(s).”

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader.

3. Smt. Turaga M.K. Praneetha, learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that the petitioners have been called to the police station and harassed without following due process of law. She further submits that the petitioners have not committed any offence and, therefore, the respondent police have no authority to take any coercive steps against them in the absence of registration of an FIR.

4. Sri P. Ajay Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home, on written instructions, submits that one of the accused in FIR No.35 of 2026 gave a confession implicating Petitioner Nos.1 and 2, who are shown as Accused Nos.4 and 9. It is alleged that Petitioner Nos.1 and 2 also participated in the grave offence of attempt to murder.

5. As seen from the record, Petitioner Nos.1 and 2 were arrayed as Accused Nos.4 and 9 based on the confession given by Accused Nos.5 and 6 in the presence of mediators. The CCTV footage also reveals the involvement of Petitioner No.1 in the attempt to murder the complainant. The Investigating Officer submits that *prima facie*, overwhelming evidence is available against Petitioner Nos.1 and 2. If Petitioner Nos.1 and 2 are arrayed as accused and incriminating material is available against them, they have an alternative remedy to approach the learned Sessions Judge for appropriate relief.

6. However, there are no allegations against Petitioner Nos.3 to 5, who are the family members of Petitioner Nos.1 and 2. Therefore, there was no

justification on the part of the police to call, summon, or harass Petitioner Nos.3 to 5.

7. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case and recording the submissions of the learned Assistant Government Pleader, the Writ Petition is disposed of, directing the respondent police not to call or harass Petitioner Nos.3 to 5. However, the Investigating Officer in Crime No.35 of 2026 is at liberty to proceed in accordance with law against Petitioner Nos.1 and 2, inasmuch as they are alleged to have committed the offence of attempt to murder the complainant. It is further left open to the Investigating Officer to proceed in accordance with law against Petitioner Nos.3 to 5 as well, if any evidence is available against them. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

DR. Y. LAKSHMANA RAO, J

Date: 31.03.2026
KMS

128

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

Writ PETITION No.7979 of 2026

Date: 31.03.2026

KMS