



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

[3457]

FRIDAY ,THE SECOND DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N

WRIT PETITION NO: 25947/2024

Between:

Katasani Rambhupal Reddy

...PETITIONER

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.P M MITHILESHWARA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.THE ADVOCATE GENERAL

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH. N**WRIT PETITION No.25947 of 2024****ORDER:**

1. The petitioner is challenging the action of the respondents in abruptly withdrawing the security (2+2 PSOs) with effect from 18.07.2024 and seeks a direction to restore the security.
2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an Ex-MLA of Panyam Assembly Constituency and that he was elected six times as an MLA from the same constituency. The petitioner apprehends danger to his life, it is submitted that the petitioner's father along with six family members were hacked to death in broad day light while travelling by a bus. It is also submitted that the petitioner's brother was also killed by the rival group. It is also submitted that all attacks on the petitioner's family were carried out when the petitioner's party lost power in the elections.
3. It is submitted that the petitioner was provided security by the Government from the year 1985 and it continued till 18.07.2024. It is submitted that the security cover was also extending even during the times when he had lost the Assembly election. It is the specific assertion of the petitioner that he received threat from

one M.Raja Sekhar, who is a leader of the party opposing the party of the petitioner and that he has been threatened of elimination. The petitioner submitted a representation after receipt of a notice from the Reserve Inspector, Armed Force to send back the PSOs as per the directions of the 3rd respondent. The petitioner submitted a representation on 23.09.2024 to the 2nd respondent, however, the same was not considered. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is facing severe threat to his life and the action of respondents is contrary to the guidelines issued by this Court. The learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner is willing to meet the financial expenditure for extending the Personal Security Officers (PSOs), considering the serious life threat.

4. The learned Government Pleader appearing for the state submits that the 4th respondent has filed a counter on 02.12.2024 and an additional counter on 28.04.2025. It is submitted by the learned Government Pleader that the incident of hacking of family members of petitioner occurred 40 years ago and thereafter no incidents had been reported. It is also specifically denied that no such incident of M.Rajasekhar publicly announcing to see the end of petitioner had ever occurred.

5. It is also submitted that threat perspective is a dynamic phenomenon and never static and as such the same is reviewed periodically. The 4th respondent further stated that there is no threat perception against the petitioner from any rival groups, political groups for providing security to the petitioner.
6. In the additional counter, it is submitted that a comprehensive assessment of threat perspective was carried out and upon evaluation of all relevant materials and inputs, it was concluded, with reasons recorded, that there is no existing threat to the life of the petitioner, either on political or personal grounds. The copy of the threat perception report dated 27.04.2025 is submitted to this Court.
7. The learned counsel for the petitioner places reliance on **G.Suryanarayana Vs. State of Andhra Pradesh**¹, this Court directed the respondents therein to obtain a fresh perception of the petitioner from the concerned unit officer and submit the same in the next review committee and in the meanwhile the security of the petitioner was restored on payment basis.
8. The learned counsel for the petitioner also places reliance on **Bhoomireddy Ramgopala Reddy Vs. State of AP, Rep.by its**

¹ 2021 SCC OnLine AP 3870

Secretary, Home Department, Velagapudi Amaravati Guntur District², the learned Judge of this Court has perused the threat perception report therein and held that the review committees report submitted is vague and incapacitates the Court to analyze and conclude that the opinion of the review committee is based on objective assessment of the facts and circumstances relating to threat perceptive and as such extended the security to the petitioner for a period of three months at his expense and further directed the security review committee to take stock of all facts and circumstances prevailing at that time and make an objective assessment and furnish its recommendations to the concerned authorities for taking further steps as required.

9. The learned Government Pleader places reliance on **Katasani Rami Reddy Vs. Govt.of A.P. and others³**, this Court held that the application for providing personal security must be decided within shortest possible time and if it is not possible then the person must be extended security till the application is decided. **WP.No.16540 of 2019, decided on 21.11.2019**, this Court while dismissing the writ petition held that the decision taken by the State Level Security cannot be altered while exercising the

² WP.No.7822 of 2019, decided on 15.07.2019

³ 1998 SCC OnLine AP 750

extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of Constitution of India. **WP.No.14445 of 2019, decided on 28.04.2020**, this Court while dismissing the writ petition relied upon the reports of a threat perception indicating that there is no present or imminent threat and denied to grant any relief. **P.Sudhakara Reddy Vs. State of AP, Rep.by its Principal Secretary, Home Department, Secretariat, Velagapudi, Guntur District⁴**, the learned Single Judge of this Court after considering the report of the Security Review Committee came to a conclusion that there is no specific threat and denied granting any relief.

10. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for the State and perused the material on record.
11. The security threat perspective report is submitted by the learned Government Pleader, the identification of sources of threat indicates that there is no threat from any individual or from any group. The report did not consider the representation of the petitioner submitted to the 2nd respondent categorically indicating the threat perspective from one M.Rajasekhar. The same appears to have not been considered by the Security Review

⁴ WP.No.12881 of 2024, decided on 14.10.2024

Committee. The security review committee meeting was conducted on 16.07.2024 and thereafter the threat perception report dated 27.04.2025 is submitted.

12. This Court has endeavored to verify whether the information provided by the respondents in the report is sufficient to conclude that the respondents have conducted a meticulous job before submitting the report. As seen from the report, the review committee ought to have done an objective assessment of all the facts and circumstances, considering the regular movements of the petitioner on a day to day basis, the report is silent on the comprehensive study conducted before concluding that there is no threat to the life of the petitioner. This Court is also handicapped with a given report to analyze and conclude that the opinion of the committee is based on objective assessment of facts and circumstances relating to the threat perception of the petitioner.
13. On these facts and circumstances, the security cover of the petitioner shall be restored on payment basis and a direction to the respondents to obtain fresh threat perception of the petitioner from the concerned Unit Officer and the same will be placed in the next review committee and to consider it on merits and pass

necessary orders. In the meantime there shall be a direction to the respondents to restore the security to the petitioner as prevailing on 17.07.2024 on payment basis.

14. With this observation the writ petition is disposed off.
15. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in these writ petitions shall stand closed.

JUSTICE HARINATH.N

Dated 02.05.2025
KGM

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH. N

WRIT PETITION No.25947 of 2024
Dated 02.05.2025

KGM