Date of reserved for orders : 29.07.2026
Date of pronouncement : 30.09.2026
Date of uploading : 01.10.2026

APHC010487612025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

AT AMARAVATI [3601]

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE PURUSHOTTAM KUMAR CHINTALAPUDI

WRIT PETITION NO: 24872/2025

Between:

1. SMT. CHINTHALACHERUVU RANI,, W/O KOTAPATI RAJASHEKHER, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS R/O GRANDHASIRI VILLAGE, ATCHAMPET MANDAL, PALNADU DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS CHIEF SECRETARY, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT, 1ST BLOCK, 1ST FLOOR, INTERIM GOVERNMENT COMPLEX, A.P. SECRETARIAT OFFICE, VELAGAPUDI, GUNTUR DISTRICT - 522503.
2. THE COLLECTOR AND DISTRICT MAGISTRATE, PALNADU DISTRICT, NARSARAOPETA.
3. THE SUPERINTENDENT, CENTRAL PRISON, RAJAMAHENDRAVARAM EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
4. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, PALNADU DISTRICT, NARSARAOPETA.

...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 tomay be pleased to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus directing the Respondents herein to produce my husband /detenue i.e. Kotapati Rajashekher, S/o Radha Krishna, aged about 36 years, R/o Grandhasiri Village, Atchampeta Mandal, Palnadu District, who is now lodged in Central Prison, Rajamahendravaram, East Godavari District, before this Honble Court and he may be set at liberty/ordered to be released forthwith by declaring the Order of Detention dated 23.08.2025 vide RC. No. 49/2025-C1 issued by the 2nd Respondent and the G.O.Rt. 1604 General Administration(SC-1) Department dt. 02.09.2025 and confirmation order vide GO Rt No.1925 dated 17.10.2025 issued by the 1st respondent as arbitrary, illegal and unconstitutional and pass such other or further orders as this Honble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case. Main prayer was amended as per c.o.dt.22.12.2025 Vide I.A.No.2 of 2025 in W.P.No.24872 of 2025.

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

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 may be pleased to grant interim bail/ order directing the 3rd respondent to release the detainee pending disposal of the writ petitioner in the interest of justice.

IA NO: 2 OF 2025

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 May be pleased to amend the main prayer from - this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus directing the Respondents herein to produce my husband /detenue i.e. Kotapati Rajashekher, S/o Radha Krishna, aged about 36 years, R/o Grandhasiri Village, Atchampeta Mandal, Palnadu District, who is now lodged in Central Prison, Rajamahendravaram, East Godavari District, before this Hon’ble Court and he may be set at liberty/ordered to be released forthwith by declaring the Order of Detention dated 23.08.2025 vide RC. No. 49/2025-C1 issued by the 2nd Respondent and the G.O.Rt. No. 1604 General Administration (SC-1) Department dt. 02.09.2025 issued by the 1®' respondent as arbitrary, illegal and unconstitutional and pass such other or further orders as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.to - this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus directing the

Respondents herein to produce my husband /detenue i.e. Kotapati Rajashekher, S/o Radha Krishna, aged about 36 years, R/o Grandhasiri Village, Atchampeta Mandal, Palnadu District, who is now lodged in Central Prison, Rajamahendravaram, East Godavari District, before this Hon'ble Court and he may be set at liberty/ordered to be released forthwith by declaring the Order of Detention dated 23.08.2025 vide RC. No. 49/2025-C1 issued by the 2nd Respondent, and the G.O.Rt.No.1604 General Administration (SC-1) Department dt. 02.09.2025 and confirmation order vide GO Rt No. 1925 dated 17.10.2025 issued by the 1®' respondent as arbitrary, illegal and unconstitutional 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 May be pleased to take on record the additional affidavit along with material papers and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. INAKOLLU VENKATESWARLU

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ADDL ADVOCATE GENERAL

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE PURUSHOTTAM KUMAR CHINTALAPUDI

WRIT PETITION NO.24872 OF 2025

ORDER: *(per Hon'ble Sri Justice Purushottam Kumar Chintalapudi)*

Mr. Kotapati Rajashekher, S/o. Radha Krishna, who has been detained by the orders of the detaining authority, has filed this writ petition seeking the relief:

> "…….to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus directing the Respondents herein to produce my husband /detenue i.e. Kotapati Rajashekher, S/o Radha Krishna, aged about 36 years, R/o Grandhasiri Village, Atchampeta Mandal, Palnadu District, who is now lodged in Central Prison, Rajamahendravaram, East Godavari District, before this Hon'ble Court and he may be set at liberty/ordered to be released forthwith by declaring the Order of Detention dated 23.08.2025 vide RC. No. 49/2025-C1 issued by the 2nd Respondent and the G.O.Rt. 1604 General Administration(SC-1) Department dt. 02.09.2025 and confirmation order vide GO Rt No.1925 dated 17.10.2025 issued by the 1st respondent as arbitrary, illegal and unconstitutional……."

Brief facts of the case:

2. The respondent No. 4 (Superindent of Police) has referred to detaining authority that, Mr. Kotapati Rajasekhar (hereinafter referred as detenu) has been involved in nearly 6 offences and his activities are prejudicial to the public order.

3. The detaining authority upon receiving the reference, considered the material placed in the reference, having come to subjective satisfaction ordered detention of detenu *vide* R.C.No.49/2025-C1, dated 23.08.2025. The said detention order was forwarded to the Advisory Board and upon its opinion, the respondent No.1, the State approved and subsequently confirmed the detention vide G.O.Rt.No.1925, dated 17.10.2025, treating the detenu as

a “goonda”. The detaining authority passed the orders basing on the alleged offences registered against detenu under the following crimes:

S No.	Crime No.	Crime Date / Place	Compl./ FIR Date	IPC/BNS Section	Complainant	Accused	Detenue under Bail (Y/N)	Remarks
a)	148/ 2018	24.3.18 Grandhasiri village	4.4.18	384, 341 R/w 34 IPC	Karnati Anil Kumar	A1-Ravella Sridhar Babu A2-Shakamuri Rama Krishna A3-Ravella Narendra A4-Kotapati Rajasekhar A5-Bollepalli Rangarao	41A Cr.P.C Notice issued, Anticipatory bail granted	Dispute regarding the Lift Irrigation Scheme.
b)	244/ 2018	19.9.18 Grandhasiri village	20.9.18	143, 147, 148, 323, R/w 149 IPC	Kotapati Appa Rao	A1-Shakamuri Rama Krishna A2-Ravella Sridhar A3-Kilari Malleswara Rao A4-Kotapati Rajasekhar A5-Kotapati Rambabu A6-Kotapati Naresh A7-Ravella Harinath Chowdhary	-	Referred to as a false case.
c)	245/ 2018	20.9.18 Grandhasiri village	20.9.18	143, 147, 148, 506, 509 R/w 149 IPC	Kilari Jaya Krupa Rao	A1-Ravella Sridhar Babu A2-Ravella Narasimha Rao A3-Ravella Narendra A4-Kotapati Rajasekhar A5-Kotapati Radha Krishna A6-Kotapati	-	Referred to as a false case.

						Nageswara Rao A7-Kotapati Naresh A8-Kotapati Ram Babu A9-Sakhamuri Rama Krishna & 12 others		
d)	25/ 2022	18.2.22 Grandhasiri village	18.2.22	324, 323 R/w 34 IPC	Kilari Sambasiva Rao	A1-Kotapati Rajashekher A2-Ravella Lavana Kumar A3-Ravella Harinath	41A Crl.P.C notice issued	Dispute on the drainage canal. The counter case is registered.
e)	163/ 2024	16.9.24 Grandhasiri Village	15.9.24	126(2), 79, 351(2), 189(2), 190 BNS	Kilari Ramarao	A1-Ravella Sridhar Babu A2-Kotapati Rajasekhar A3-Shakamuri Rama Krishna & 30 others	35(3) of BNSS notice issued	During the Ganesh idol processio n,
f)	18/ 2025	2.2.25 Grandhasiri village	2.2.25	115(2), 109, 118(2), 351(1), R/w 3(5) of BNS	Kilari Balaram, S/o Kilari Samba Siva Rao	A1-Ravella Sridhar Babu A2-Kotapati Raja Shekher	Anticipat ory bail granted by the Hon'ble HC of AP	

4. The petitioner has challenged the detention order on various grounds

Contentions of the Petitioner:

5. Petitioner asserts that, In Crime No.148 of 2018, anticipatory bail was granted. Crime Nos.244 of 2018 and 245 of 2018 were referred as false cases. In Crime No.25 of 2022, notice under Section 41-A Cr.P.C. was issued. In Crime No.163 of 2024, notice under Section 35(3) of the BNSS was issued. The issuance of notice under Section 41-A Cr.P.C. is an indication that there are no criminal antecedents against the detenu.

6. In Crime No.18 of 2025, the detenu was granted anticipatory bail.Thus there is no *prima facie* material that, the detenu was involved in the alleged offence.

7. Crime No.148 of 2018 relates to a dispute regarding the Grandhasiri Lift Irrigation Scheme. The petitioner contends that it is a law and order problem and not a public order problem.

8. Prosecution referred Crime Nos.244 of 2018 and 245 of 2018 as false.This would show there is no such involvement of detenu in the crime.

9. Crime No.25 of 2022 relates to a dispute concerning a drainage canal, in respect of which a counter-case was registered. Notice under Section 41-A Cr.P.C. was issued.

10. Crime No.163 of 2024 relates to an incident during the Ganesh idol procession. Notice under Section 35(3) of the BNSS was issued. The petitioner contends that it does not relate to public order.

11 The detaining authority did not explain the impact of the aforesaid crimes and the subjective satisfaction for passing the detention order.All the crimes allegedly arose out of disputes between two groups in the village and the detenu was falsely implicated. The detaining authority has falsely invoked the provisions of the Act and treated/declared the detenu as a “goonda”, though the provision does not apply to him. The detention order was, therefore, erroneously issued, approved by the Advisory Board and confirmed by Respondent No.1.

Respondent’s case:

12. Detaining authority (Respondent No.2) filed a counter stating that the detention order was passed in accordance with the due procedure of law.

13. Subjective satisfaction was recorded as the detenu was involved in six crimes. His activities were causing widespread danger to public order and creating fear and insecurity among the general public. He is an habitual

offender and involved in prejudicial activities and was, therefore, treated as a "goonda".

14. The proposals submitted by Respondent No.4 were placed before Respondent No.2. Thereafter, detention proceedings were issued vide No.R.C.No.49/2025-C1, dated 23.08.2025. The detenu was sent to Central Prison, Rajahmundry, with a view to preventing him from indulging in goonda activities prejudicial to the maintenance of public order.

15. The detention order was passed following the prescribed procedure. The detenu was informed that his case would be referred to the Advisory Board and that he had a right to seek a personal hearing.

16. Detaining authority addressed to Respondent No.1 (hereinafter referred as State) for approval of the detention order. Respondent No.1 forwarded the recommendation to the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board reviewed the case, the detenu appeared through video conference, board heard the detenu and opined that there was sufficient cause for his detention. The report was thereafter forwarded to Respondent No.1.

17. Respondent No.1, after considering the recommendation and the opinion of the Advisory Board, confirmed the detention order vide proceedings dated 17.10.2025.

Arguments:

18. Learned counsel for petitioner and Sri Kirthi Teja Kondaveeti, learned Government Pleader attached to the Office of Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents have advanced their submissions.

Petitioner's arguments:

19. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted his arguments based on the grounds urged in the writ affidavit. The writ petitioner filed I.A.No.1 of 2026 seeking leave to file an additional affidavit along with material papers bringing to the chronology of the events, of various crimes, their status. The same was allowed and the additional affidavit was received.

20. Learned counsel submitted that though six alleged crimes were registered against the detenu, Crime Nos.244 of 2018 and 245 of 2018 were referred as false and, therefore, effectively only four cases are to be considered.

21. In Crime No.25 of 2022 and Crime No.163 of 2024, notices under Section 41-A Cr.P.C. and Section 35(3) of the BNSS, respectively, were issued, and the detenu was not arrested. In Crime No.148 of 2018 and Crime No.18 of 2025, anticipatory bail was granted to him.

22. He submitted that the detaining authority did not effectively consider the issuance of notices, the cases being referred as false and the grant of anticipatory bail. He relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **NenavathBujji v. The State of Telangana and others**[1].

23. Learned counsel submitted that the detaining authority has to specifically refer to the subjective satisfaction arrived at on the basis of the material placed by the referring/sponsoring authority and should take into consideration only relevant and vital material for arriving at the requisite subjective satisfaction.

24. If the detaining authority takes into consideration unnecessary or irrelevant circumstances, the subjective satisfaction would be vitiated, and the detention order should clearly and categorically reflect that the detaining authority has arrived at the requisite satisfaction that, unless the detenu is detained under the Act, it would be difficult to maintain public order.

25. Learned counsel submitted that the detention order does not reflect any of the conditions laid down in **NenavathBujji**(supra), and hence sought to allow the writ petition.

Respondent's arguments:

26. Sri Kirthi Teja Kondaveeti, learned Government Pleader, refuting the aforesaid submission submitted that the detaining authority passed a detailed

[1](2024) 17 SCC 294

detention order explaining the reasons for arriving at the conclusion that the activities of the detenu would affect public order. Hence, the detention order was properly passed.

27. Referring of the cases as false is only a procedure adopted by the prosecution before taking cognizance by the respective Courts. The said Courts did not pass any orders referring the cases as false. Therefore, the allegation that the cases were referred as false is not a binding factor and is not relevant material to deny the detention order.

28. Learned Government Pleader relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Haradhan Saha v. State of West Bengal**[2]and submitted that the past acts of the detenue are material for assessing his future course of conduct and probable conduct. The nature of proceedings under the preventive detention Act is different from other proceedings.

29. Learned Government Pleader further relied upon **State of Maharashtra and others v. BhauraoPunjabrao Gawande**[3]and submitted that the duty of the Court is to safeguard the life and liberty of an individual, while the authorities discharging statutory functions should not be impeded or interfered with without jurisdiction.

30. He further argued that, the challenge based on issuance of notices under Section 41-A Cr.P.C. and Section 35(3) of the BNSS in Crime Nos.25 of 2022 and 163 of 2024 is irrelevant. The issuance of such procedural notices does not mean that the detenu had clean antecedents.

31. The reference of Crime Nos.244 of 2018 and 245 of 2018 as false cannot be considered in isolation. The assessment of the detaining authority depends upon the activities of the detenu and their impact on public peace and public order.

32. The respondent has filed an additional affidavit bringing to the notice of this Court that the final reports in the above crimes have not been filed before

[2] (1975) 3 SCC 198
[3] (2008) 3 SCC 613

the concerned Court. As such, there was no occasion for the concerned Court to consider the said cases as having been referred as ‘False’.

33. The detaining authority relied upon credible material and arrived at the requisite subjective satisfaction. The activities of the detenu were considered and found to have affected public order.

34. The detaining authority considered the issuance of notices under Section 41-A Cr.P.C. and Section 35(3) of the BNSS, the reference of the cases as false and the grant of bail, and thereafter made a comprehensive assessment of the activities of the detenu and their impact on public peace.

35. The detention order was passed after considering the impact of the activities of the detenu on public peace and public order. Six activities were considered to be prejudicial to the maintenance of public order.Hence, the respondents sought dismissal of the Writ Petition.

36. We have heard learned counsels and have gone through the record.

Discussion:

37. The factual aspects show that the detaining authority, upon the proposal sent by the respondent No.4against the detenu and relying upon six registered crimes, passed a detailed detention order, concluding that the involvement of the detenu in the above crimes was prejudicial to the maintenance of public order.

38. In the detention order, it specifically noted that, the matter be forwarded to the Advisory Board and the detenu has a right to make a representation before the Advisory Board and to receive the relevant material. Petitioner has not raised any ground that, the detenu was not provided for hearing before the Board or that relevant material upon which detention was ordered was not served upon him. The detention order was passed accordingly.

39. The Advisory Board followed the prescribed procedure and, after the appearance of the detenu, passed its opinion and forwarded the same to the

State. The State considered the opinion of the Advisory Board and the detention order and confirmed the detention for a period of twelve months.

40. Learned counsel for the petitioner relied upon **NenavathBujji**(supra). In the said ruling, the summary of findings laid by the Hon'ble Apex Courtis as follows:

> **"(*ii*) *Summary of the findings***
>
> **45.** We summarise our conclusions as under:
>
> **45.1.** The detaining authority should take into consideration only relevant and vital material to arrive at the requisite subjective satisfaction.
>
> **45.2.** It is an unwritten law, constitutional and administrative, that wherever a decision-making function is entrusted to the subjective satisfaction of the statutory functionary, there is an implicit duty to apply his mind to the pertinent and proximate matters and eschew those which are irrelevant and remote.
>
> **45.3.** There can be no dispute about the settled proposition that the detention order requires subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority which, ordinarily, cannot be questioned by the court for insufficiency of material. Nonetheless, if the detaining authority does not consider relevant circumstances or considers wholly unnecessary, immaterial and irrelevant circumstances, then such subjective satisfaction would be vitiated.
>
> **45.4.** In quashing the order of detention, the Court does not sit in judgment over the correctness of the subjective satisfaction. The anxiety of the Court should be to ascertain as to whether the decision-making process for reaching the subjective satisfaction is based on objective facts or influenced by any caprice, malice or irrelevant considerations or non-application of mind.
>
> **45.5.** While making a detention order, the authority should arrive at a proper satisfaction which should be reflected clearly, and in categorical terms, in the order of detention.
>
> **45.6.** The satisfaction cannot be inferred by mere statement in the order that "it was necessary to prevent the detenu from acting in a manner prejudicial to the maintenance of public order". Rather the detaining authority will have to justify the detention order from the material that existed before him and

> the process of considering the said material should be reflected in the order of detention while expressing its satisfaction.
>
> **45.7.** Inability on the part of the State's police machinery to tackle the law and order situation should not be an excuse to invoke the jurisdiction of preventive detention.
>
> **45.8.** Justification for such an order should exist in the ground(s) furnished to the detenu to reinforce the order of detention. It cannot be explained by reason(s)/grounds(s) not furnished to the detenu. The decision of the authority must be the natural culmination of the application of mind to the relevant and material facts available on the record; and
>
> **45.9.** To arrive at a proper satisfaction warranting an order of preventive detention, the detaining authority must, *first* examine the material adduced against the prospective detenu to satisfy itself whether his conduct or antecedent(s) reflect that he has been acting in a manner prejudicial to the maintenance of public order and, second, if the aforesaid satisfaction is arrived at, it must further consider whether it is likely that the said person would act in a manner prejudicial to the public order in near future unless he is prevented from doing so by passing an order of detention. For passing a detention order based on subjective satisfaction, the answer of the aforesaid aspects and points must be against the prospective detenu. The absence of application of mind to the pertinent and proximate material and vital matters would show lack of statutory satisfaction on the part of the detaining authority."

41. The above proposition of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court would show that Courts shall not sit in judgment over the correctness of the subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority recording in the detention order. The Court should see as to whether the decision-making process for reaching the subjective satisfaction is based on objective facts or influenced by any caprice, malice or irrelevant considerations or non-application of mind. The Courts should see that the detention order was passed with an observation that it is necessary to prevent the detenu from acting in a manner prejudicial to the maintenance of public order.

42. Keeping the aforesaid in view andapplying to the present facts, there are six crimes registered against the detenu. This Court perused the detention order. The detaining authority discussed the relevant material, including the notices under Section 41-A Cr.P.C. and Section 35(3) of the BNSS, reference of the cases as false and the grant of anticipatory bail.

43. The detaining authority specifically noted that the detenu, along with his associates, acting with common intention, committed offences of voluntarily causing hurt, attempt to murder and criminal intimidation. The offences arose out of a land dispute and, due to the criminal attitude and dangerous activities of the detenu, the public, particularly the witnesses, were living in fear.

44. The detenu was allegedly using muscle power and money power to threaten the witnesses. He is said to be involved in various other crimes, one extortion case, two riot cases and three bodily offence cases, one of which was an attempt to murder, using deadly weapons such as a crowbar and sticks. He was also involved in rioting cases wherein chilli powder was used.

45. The order further reads that, a history sheet was opened against the detenu, treating him as a habitual criminal, dangerous and desperate and hardened. The ordinary provisions of the Penal Code/BNS would not have a deterrent effect upon his violent acts. Preventive detention was, therefore, invoked and the detenu was properly identified as a “goonda” under Section 2(g) of the Andhra Pradesh Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Dacoits, Drug Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders and Land Grabbers Act, 1986.

46. The record further shows that, in the crime No.244 of 2018, the Sub-Divisional Police Officer (SDPO) passed orders to submit a final report, stating that, seven witnesses were examined and among them, except the complainant, none of the witnesses supported the version of the complainant; instead, the witnesses denied the version of the complainant. The detaining authority recorded that, the witnesses are turning hostile. The authority has considered all the relevant materials placed before it along with the proposals

and the requisite subjective satisfaction of disturbance to the public order was arrived at.

49. The contention of the petitioner's counsel is that these are village disputes and constitute only a law and order problem cannot be accepted. The detaining authority, discussed the same and held that, because of the rivalry between the two groups, the detenu committed criminal activities by using weapons and a crowbar and, in the course of the village rivalry, caused disturbance to public peace and public order by various activities. The allegations of threat to the witnesses, involved in the village disputes, alleged causing disturbance of public order, using chilli powder etc, show that, the detaining authority has rightly held it to be a threat to the public order.

50. Further section 41 Cr.P.C. notices were issued in Crime No.148 of 2018 and Crime No.25 of 2022, and a notice under Section 35(3) of the BNSS was issued in Crime No.163 of 2024 prior to the detention order, and they were taken into consideration. Despite these notices, the detenu was involved in other offences. As to the ground relating to Crime Nos.244 of 2018 and 245 of 2018, the said cases were stated to be referred as false cases, but the additional affidavit states that the concerned authorities have not placed the final reports before the concerned Court and consequently at this stage, it cannot be said that, those false cases, those could not be taken out of consideration.

51. The ground relating to Crime No.18 of 2025, wherein anticipatory bail was granted by the High Court, was also considered by the detaining authority. There is no bar that, on granting bail, the detaining authority shall not pass an order of detention, if the detaining authority is satisfied that the detenu is involved in activities prejudicial to public orderinspite of grant of bail.

52. Applying the principles laid down in **NenavathBujji** (supra), and considering, we are of the view, that, the decision-making process for reaching the subjective satisfaction is based on objective facts. The detaining authority has considered the relevant subject material placed before it and the

said subjective satisfaction cannot be reviewed by this Court, as the Court does not sit in appeal over the correctness of the subjective satisfaction.

55. The Writ Petition is devoid of merits and is dismissed.

56. No order as to costs.

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

RAVI NATH TILHARI,J

PURUSHOTTAM KUMAR CHINTALAPUDI,J

Date: 30.09.2026
DSV

81

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE PURUSHOTTAM KUMAR CHINTALAPUDI

WRIT PETITION NO: 24872/2025

(per Hon'ble Sri Justice Purushottam Kumar Chintalapudi)

Date: 30.09.2026

DSV