



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

[3521]

MONDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 3377/2026

Between:

1. PARPALLI SATYAVANI, W/O. SRINIVASULU, AGED 46 YEARS, R/O.
MAIN BAZAR, CHINNAGANIPALLE CHOLLA VEEDU POST,
RACHARLA MANDAL, PRAKASAM DISTRICT-523372.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, HOME DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI,
AMARAVATHI-522238. 2.

2. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, ONGOLE, PRAKASAM
DISTRICT-523002. 3.

3. INSPECTOR OF POLICE, GIDDALURU RURAL POLICE STATION,
PRAKASAM DISTRICT-523357. 4.

4. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, GIDDALURU RURAL POLICE
STATION, PRAKASAM DISTRICT-523357. 5.

5. ANGAM SIVA SANKAR, S/O. VEERAI AH, AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,
R/O. D.NO. 28/1154-D2 NEAR SRISAILA PUBLIC SCHOOL, SAI BABA
NAGAR, NANDYALA, NANDYALA MANDAL AND DISTRICT-518501.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. RAMAKRISHNA AKURATHI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR HOME

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

The Writ Petition has been filed for the following relief:

“...to issue an appropriate writ or order or a direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the 3RD respondent interfering in the civil dispute, calling the petitioner and made her to sit in the police station and pressurised the petitioner to obey his orders and threatened her with dire consequences to return the sale consideration amount to the respondent without there being any jurisdiction or authority of law, as is illegal, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and also violative of principles of natural justice, consequently direct the 3RD respondent not to interfere in Civil dispute and not to summon the petitioner...”

2. Heard learned counsel for Petitioner and learned Assistant Government Pleader.

3. Sri Akurathi Rama Krishna, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that Respondent No.3 has been interfering in the civil dispute by calling the petitioner to the police station, compelling her to remain there, and pressurising her to obey his orders. He further threatened her with dire consequences, demanding that she return the sale consideration amount to Respondent No.5, despite having no jurisdiction or authority in law.

4. Sri P.Ajay Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader, on written instructions, submits that the Petitioner purchased Ac.1.98 cents in Sy.No.231 under Document No.2706/2021 and claims peaceful possession. On 23.12.2025, the Respondent No.3 initiated a preliminary inquiry based on a complaint alleging fraudulent sale of Agrigold-declared lands. Pursuant to Collector's orders, permission was obtained to conduct enquiry. The enquiry

revealed the dispute is civil in nature. It is further submitted that the Petitioner was never called upon, directed, or coerced by the police to refund any sale consideration, instead, both parties were advised to seek remedy before the competent Civil Court.

5. Considering the 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 No.3 not to interfere further in the civil dispute between the Petitioner and the Respondent No.5.

6. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

Dr.Y. LAKSHMANA RAO, J

Dated: 23.02.2026
PRA

59

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE Y. LAKSHMANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 3377 of 2026

Date: 23.02.2026
PRA