

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT
HYDERABAD**

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

**WEDNESDAY, THE THIRTIETH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND NINE**

PRESENT

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GHULAM MOHAMMED

WRIT PETITION No.21100 of 2009

Between:

B.Sailesh Saxena.

... Petitioner

And

1. Government of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. By its Secretary, Home Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The Commissioner of Police, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad.

... Respondents

The Court made the following:

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GHULAM MOHAMMED

WRIT PETITION No.21100 OF 2009

ORDER: -

This writ petition is filed for a writ of Mandamus to direct the respondents to provide a security guard to the petitioner with a weapon, as stated in the representations dated 11.06.2009, 17.07.2009 and 21.08.2009.

The facts of the case, in brief, are that the petitioner is a practicing advocate in twin cities as well as Ranga Reddy District Courts. It is stated that the petitioner is handling a case of Mr.Iqbal Islam Khan and others who are the owners of Ac.78.28 guntas in

various survey numbers of Gudimalkapur, Asifnagar Mandal, Hyderabad District. The said lands were encroached by some persons and hence L.G.C.No.39 of 2004 was filed before the Special Court of A.P. Land Grabbing (Prohibition) Act. It is stated that eight writ petitions are also filed in respect of the land, which is subject matter of the above-referred L.G.C., and they are pending. It is further stated that the respondents in the above L.G.C., who have got grudge against the petitioner for prosecuting the case of his clients, are giving threats to his life as well as to his family members.

The grievance of the petitioner in this writ petition is that he has made representations on 11.06.2009, 17.07.2009 and 21.08.2009 to the respondents to provide a security guard to him with a weapon. But, the respondents having received the said representations, have not taken any action to provide a security guard to him with a weapon. Hence, the writ petition.

Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the record. It is seen that the petitioner made representations to respondent No.1 on 17.07.2009 and to respondent No.2 on 11.06.2009 and 21.08.2009 to provide a security guard to him with a weapon, but the authorities have not acted upon the said representations. Therefore, without going into the merits of the case or otherwise, it is appropriate to direct respondents 1 and 2 to consider the representations of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and communicate the same to the petitioner.

With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

MOHAMMED, J)

30.09.2009.

Lmv/Stp

(GHULAM