

Date of reserved for orders :19.09.2026
Date of pronouncement : 24.09.2026
Date of uploading : 24.09.2026

APHC010199012026



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

THURSDAY, THE 24th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE SUNITHA GANDHAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 10194 OF 2026

Between:

1. Smt.Talasila Santhi, W/o Venkata Narasimha Rao Age 45 years Occ
Housewife R/o D.NO.5-186, Flat No.302, Sreevanam Residence
Prasadampadu, Vijayawada, NTR Dist-521108

...Petitioner

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep.by its Chief Secretary A.P.Secretariat,
Velagapudi At Amaravati, Guntur Dist.522238
2. The Collector and District Magistrate, Nellore Town at S.P.S Nellore Dist.-
524001
3. The Superintendent of Police, Nellore town at S.P.S Nellore Dist.-52001
4. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Kadapa, YSR Kadapa Dist. 516002

...Respondents

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 to may be pleased to issue a writ or direction preferably writ of Habeas Corpus under Article 226 of the Constitution of India directing the 4th respondent to produce Talasila Venkata Narasimha Rao, who is now detained in Central Prison, Kadapa, YSR Kadapa Dist., before this Honble Court and he may be ordered to be released forthwith by declaring his detention vide order Rc.C1(Magl)/06/2025 dt 19-01-2026 passed by the 2nd respondent and confirmation order issued by the 1st respondent vide G.O.Rt.No.546 dt 11-03-2026 confirming the detention order for a period of 12 months (from 20-1-2026) as illegal and unconstitutional, and subsequently, set-aside the rejection endorsement issued by the 2nd respondent vide Rc.C1(Magl)/06/2026 dt.07.07.2026 and the consequential confirmation order issued by the 1st respondent vide G.O.Rt.No.1384 dt.14.07.2026 dt. 01.03.2026 and rejecting the petitioner's representation consequently, direct the respondents to release the detainee forthwith, and pass such other order or orders as this Honble Court may deem fit and proper in the interests of justice. Main prayer was amended as per c.o.dt.19.08.2026 Vide I.A.No.2 of 2026 in W.P.No.10194 of 2026.

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 suspend the GO Rt No.546 dt 11-03-2026 issued by the 1st respondent and direct the respondents to release the detainee namely Talasila Venkata Narasimha Rao pending disposal of the main WP in the interest of justice

IA NO: 2 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 permit the petitioner to amend the prayer in W.P.No.10194/2026 and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may be deems fit and proper in the circumstances of the present case. ORIGINAL PRAYER (A) Hence, it is prayed that this Hon'ble court may be

pleased to issue a writ or direction preferably writ of Habeas Corpus under Article 226 of the Constitution of India directing the 4th respondent to produce Talasila Venkata Narasimha Rao, who is now detained in Central Prison, Kadapa, YSR Kadapa Dist., before this Hon'ble Court and he may be ordered to be released forthwith by declaring his detention vide order Rc.C1(MagI)/06/2025 dt:19-01-2026 passed by the 2nd respondent and confirmation order issued by the 1st respondent vide G.O.Rt.No.546 dt:11-03-2026 confirming the detention order for a period of 12 months (from 20-1-2026) as illegal and unconstitutional and pass any other order this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the interest of Justice. AMENDMENT SEEKING AS UNDER Hence, it is prayed that this Hon'ble court may be pleased to issue a writ or direction preferably writ of Habeas Corpus under Article 226 of the Constitution of India directing the 4th respondent to produce Talasila Venkata Narasimha Rao, who is now detained in Central Prison, Kadapa, YSR Kadapa Dist., before this Hon'ble Court and he may be ordered to be released forthwith by declaring his detention vide order Rc.C1(MagI)/06/2025 dt:19-01-2026 passed by the 2nd respondent and confirmation order issued by the 1st respondent vide G.O.Rt.No.546 dt:11-03-2026 confirming the detention order for a period of 12 months (from 20-1-2026) as illegal and unconstitutional, and subsequently, set-aside the rejection endorsement issued by the 2nd respondent vide Rc.C1(MagI)/06/2026 dt.07.07.2026 and the consequential confirmation order issued by the 1st respondent vide G.O.Rt.No.1384 dt.14.07.2026 rejecting the petitioner's representation dt. 01.03.2026; and consequently, direct the respondents to release the detenue forthwith, and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner: M M M SRINIVASA RAO

Counsel for the Respondents: ADDL ADVOCATE GENERAL

The Court made the following order:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE SUNITHA GANDHAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 10194 OF 2026

ORDER: :- (per Hon'ble Sri Justice Ravi Nath Tilhari)

Heard Sri Gudapati Venkateswara Rao, learned counsel representing Sri M.M.M.Srinivasa Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Akula Venkata Sai Jagadeesh, learned Assistant Government Pleader attached to the office of the learned Additional Advocate General, appearing for the respondents.

2. The petitioner, who is wife of the detenu, filed the writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, challenging the order of preventive detention and seeking a writ of *Habeas Corpus* for his release.

3. The 2nd respondent- Collector & District Magistrate, Nellore Town at S.P.S.Nellore District, passed an order of preventive detention against the detenu, *vide* proceedings in **Rc.C1/(Magl)/06/2025**, dated **19.01.2026**, under Section 3(1) & (2) of the Andhra Pradesh Prevention of Bootleggers, Dacoits, Drug Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders and Land Grabbers Act, 1986 (for short, "the Act, 1986").

4. After the receipt of a report from the Advisory Board dated **17.02.2026**, the detention order was confirmed by the State *vide* **G.O.Rt.No.546**, General Administration (SC-I) Department, dated **11.03.2026**,

for a period of twelve months from the date of detention i.e., from 20.01.2026.

The detention order was passed based on **five (05)** criminal cases pending against the detenu. List of those cases is as under : -

Sl. No	Cr.No., Date & Police Station	Police stations
1.	Cr.No.52 of 2024, Dated 10.06.2024 U/s.143, 323, 365, 506 r/w 149 IPC,	Jaladanki P.S.,
2.	Cr. No. 45 of 2025 Dated 18.05.2025 U/s.329(3), 234(4), 351(2) r/w 3(5) of BNS	Jaladanki P.S.,
3.	Cr. No. 73 of 2025 Dated 25.07.2025 U/s 329(3), 234(5), 303(2), 351 (2) r/w 3(5) of BNS	Jaladanki P.S.,
4.	Cr. No. 76 of 2025 Dated 29.07.2025 U/s 75(1), 115(2), 351(2) r/w 3(5) BNS & Sec.3(1)(r)(s), 3(1)(w)(i), 3(1)(z), 3(2)(va) SCs & STs (POA) Act.	Jaladanki P.S.,
5.	Cr. No. 116 of 2025 Dated 26.11.2025 U/s 103(1), 61(2) r/w 3(5) BNS	Jaladanki P.S.,

5. In view of the subsequent developments, i.e., the rejection of the detenu's representation by the State Government *vide* **G.O.Rt.No.1384** General Administration (SC-I) Department, dated **14.07.2026**, the prayer in the writ petition was amended, so as to challenge that order as well, pursuant to the order dated 19.08.2026 passed by this Court in I.A.No.2 of 2026.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner, while challenging the order of preventive detention, submits that, in Ground No.5, i.e., in Crime No.116 of 2025 of Jaladanki Police Station, the detenu was granted bail on 06.02.2026, which

fact was not considered in the order of confirmation, though it was required to be considered, as the bail was granted subsequent to the passing of the preventive detention order. He further submits that, in Ground No.5, the detaining authority was required to consider the applicability of the triple test, since the detenu was in judicial custody at the time of passing of the preventive detention order.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner submitted a representation dated 01.03.2026, but the same was not considered while passing the order of confirmation on 11.03.2026. On the said representation, remarks were submitted by the District Collector to the State Government on 07.07.2026, and the order rejecting the representation was passed on 14.07.2026. In the rejection order, the fact that bail had been granted on 06.02.2026 was not taken into consideration. Thereafter, pursuant to the order dated 20.07.2026 passed in the present writ petition, another representation dated 28.07.2026 was submitted, but the same has also been rejected, vide **G.O.Rt.No.1796** General Administration (SC-I) Department, dated **15.09.2026**. In the rejection order dated 15.09.2026, there is mention of the bail order, dated 06.02.2026. There is also an unexplained delay in considering the representation and, there is also no consideration of the bail conditions. Consequently, the continued detention of the detenu would become illegal and he would be entitled for release.

8. Learned Assistant Government Pleader submits that, insofar as Ground No.5 is concerned, the detaining authority has taken into consideration

the fact that, although the detenu was in judicial custody, there was a possibility of his being released on bail and, upon such release, of his indulging in similar criminal activities, thereby causing prejudice to public order. Such satisfaction has been clearly recorded in the preventive detention order, which was thereafter confirmed by the State Government.

9. With regard to decision on the representation, learned Government Pleader submits that the representation was not considered while passing the order of confirmation, though it had been submitted prior to the passing of the confirmation order. The representation was however, rejected by order dated 14.07.2026. He submits that the delay occurred on account of the detaining authority having submitted its remarks belatedly on 07.07.2026. He further submits that another representation of the detenu was rejected on 15.09.2026 taking into account the bail order dated 06.02.2026.

10. We have considered the aforesaid submissions of the learned counsels for the parties and perused the material on record.

11. The challenge to the order of preventive detention is primarily on two grounds, namely, that the subsequent grant of bail to the detenu in Crime No.116 of 2025 of Jaladanki Police Station on 06.02.2026 was not taken into consideration by the State while confirming the order of preventive detention and secondly that in rejecting the representation, there is an unexplained delay of more than four (04) months.

12. Insofar the first submission, on as Ground No.5 is concerned, it is not in dispute that, at the time of passing of the order of preventive detention, the detenu was in judicial custody in Crime No.116 of 2025 of Jaladanki Police Station. The detaining authority has taken note of the said fact and recorded its satisfaction that there was a possibility of the detenu being released on bail and, upon such release, of his indulging in similar criminal activities prejudicial to the maintenance of public order. Therefore, the contention that the factum of the detenu being in judicial custody was not taken into consideration cannot be accepted.

13. Learned Assistant Government Pleader has placed reliance in ***Union of India and Joint Secretary (COFEPOSA) Govt. of India, Ministry of Finance v. Dimple Happy Dhakad***¹, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court held at paragraph No.33 reads as under :

“33. It is well settled that the order of detention can be validly passed against a person in custody and for that purpose, it is necessary that the grounds of detention must show that the detaining authority was aware of the fact that the detenu was already in custody. The detaining authority must be further satisfied that the detenu is likely to be released from custody and the nature of activities of the detenu indicate that if he is released, he is likely to indulge in such prejudicial activities and therefore, it is necessary to detain him in order to prevent him from engaging in such activities.”

¹ 2019 (20) SCC 609

14. We find force in the submission of the learned Assistant Government Pleader that, insofar as Ground No.5 is concerned, at the time of passing of the detention order, the detenu was in judicial custody and the detaining authority has taken into consideration the said aspect, which is clearly reflected in the order of preventive detention. The detaining authority has also recorded its satisfaction that, although the detenu was in judicial custody, there was a possibility of his being released on bail and, in the event of such release, indulging in such criminal activities as would cause prejudice to the maintenance of public order. Consequently, insofar as Ground No.5 is concerned, we do not find any illegality in the order of preventive detention, as passed by the detaining authority as on the date of the order.

15. However, when the bail was granted after the detention order, the confirming authority must have taken into consideration that grant of bail, which was not considered. There is no consideration of the detenu's representation dated 01.03.2026, while confirming the preventive detention order, which required an independent consideration, at that stage as well, also taking into account the bail order dated 06.02.2026 with its conditions for the decision to confirm or not to confirm the order of preventive detention.

16. The detenu's representation dated 01.03.2026 is not in dispute. The representation was submitted by the detenu prior to the order of confirmation dated 11.03.2026. The representation was ultimately rejected on 14.07.2026 by

the State. The record discloses on which there is no dispute that the remarks of the District Collector on the representation were submitted to the State Government only on 07.07.2026 i.e., after almost four (04) months of the representation and that too without considering the bail order. The subsequent representation dated 28.07.2026 has also been rejected on 15.09.2026 which is also after almost 45 days. In this order of rejection, the bail order has been mentioned, but no due consideration of the bail conditions is reflected. The Principal Secretary to State, has observed that the detenu previously did not submit the bail order for consideration by the detaining authority or the confirming authority. Such an observation or the view taken cannot be sustained. In the preventive detention matters, like the present one, the burden is on the detaining authority/confirming order to justify its order on consideration of the material. It is a matter of deprivation of personal liberty of a person, which is the most valuable fundamental right guaranteed by the Article 21 of the Constitution of India. It is not for the detenu, but for the sponsoring authority to place complete relevant material before the detaining authority and the confirming authority. No fault could be found with the detenu or the person making the representation on his behalf. Even after placing the copy of the bail order, while rejecting the representation dated 28.07.2026, no independent consideration has been made.

17. In ***Rama Dhondu Borade v. V.K. Saraf, Commissioner of Police***², it was held that where the delay in considering the representation is unreasonably long and the explanation offered by the authority is unsatisfactory, such delay would vitiate the continued detention.

18. In ***K.M.Abdulla Kunhi and B.L.Abdul Khader v. Union of India and others***³, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that Article 22(5) casts a constitutional obligation upon the concerned authority to consider and dispose of the representation as expeditiously as possible and that any unexplained delay in disposal of the representation would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal.

19. In ***K.M.Abdulla Kunhi*** (*supra*) the Hon'ble Apex Court held that the representation relates to the liberty of the individual, the highly cherished right enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Clause (5) of Article 22 therefore casts a legal obligation on the Government to consider the representation as early as possible. It is a constitutional mandate, commanding the concerned authority to whom the detenu submits his representation to consider the representation and dispose of the same as expeditiously as possible. The words 'as soon as may be' occurring in clause (5) of Article 22 reflects the concern of the framers that the representation should be

² (1989) 3 SCC 173

³ (1991) 1 SCC 476

expeditiously considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency without an avoidable delay.

20. Para No.12 of **K.M.Abdulla Kunhi** (supra) reads as under:

*"The representation relates to the liberty of the individual, the highly cherished right enshrined in Article 21 of our Constitution. Clause (5) of Article 22 therefore, casts a legal obligation on the government to consider the representation as early as possible. It is a constitutional mandate commanding the concerned authority to whom the detenu submits his representation to consider the representation and dispose of the same as expeditiously as possible. The words "as soon as may be" occurring in clause (5) of Article 22 reflects the concern of the Framers that the representation should be expeditiously considered and disposed of with a sense of urgency without an avoidable delay. However, there can be no hard and fast rule in this regard. It depends upon the facts and circumstances of each case. There is no period prescribed either under the Constitution or under the concerned detention law, within which the representation should be dealt with. The requirement however, is that there should not be supine indifference, slackness or callous attitude in considering the representation. **Any unexplained delay in the disposal of representation would be a breach of the constitutional imperative and it would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal.** This has been emphasised and re-emphasised by a series of decisions of this Court. (See: Jayanarayan Sukul v. State of W.M. [(1970) 1 SCC 219]; Frances Coralie Mullin v. W.C. Khambra [(1980) 2 SCC 275: 1980 SCC (Cri) 419]; Rama Dhondu Borade v. V.K. Saraf, Commissioner of Police [(1989) 3 SCC 173 : 1989 SCC (Cri) 520] and Aslam Ahmed Zahire Ahmed Shaik v. Union of India [(1989) 3 SCC 277 : 1989 SCC (Cri) 554] .)"*

21. In **K.M.Abdulla Kunhi** (supra), the Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court further held that if the detenu does not exercise his right

to make representation against the order of detention but presents the representation to the Government after the Government has confirmed the order of detention, the Government still has to consider such representation and release the detenu if the detention is not within the power conferred under the statute. It was held that so long as the representation is independently considered by the Government and if there is no delay in considering the representation, the fact that it is considered after the confirmation of the detention makes little difference on the validity of the detention or confirmation of the detention. Paragraph Nos.19 and 20 of **K.M.Abdulla Kunhi** (supra) read as under:

"19. There is no constitutional mandate under cl. (5) of Article 22, much less any statutory requirement to consider the representation before confirming the order of detention. As long as the Government without delay considers the representation with an unbiased mind there is no basis for concluding that the absence of independent consideration is the obvious result if the representation is not considered before the confirmation of detention. Indeed, there is no justification for imposing this restriction on the power of the Government. As observed earlier, the Government's consideration of the representation is for a different purpose, namely to find out whether the detention is in conformity with the power under the statute. This has been explained in Haradhan Saha case, where Ray, C.J., speaking for the Constitution Bench observed that the consideration of the representation by the Government is only to ascertain whether the detention order is in conformity with the power under the law. There need not be a speaking order in disposing such representation. There is also no failure of justice by the order not being a Speaking order. All that is necessary is that there should be real and proper consideration by the Government.

20. It is necessary to mention that with regard to **liberty of citizens the court stands guard over the facts and requirements of law, but court cannot draw presumption against any authority without material. It may be borne in mind that the confirmation of detention does not preclude the government from revoking the order of detention upon considering the representation.** Secondly, there may be cases where the government has to consider the representation only after confirmation of detention. Clause (5) of Article 22 suggests that the representation could be received even after confirmation of the order of detention. The words 'shall afford him the earliest opportunity of making a representation against the order in clause (5) of Article 22 suggest that the obligation of the government is to offer the detenu an opportunity of making a representation against the order, before it is confirmed according to the procedure laid down under Section 8 of the Act. But if the detenu does not exercise his right to make representation at that stage, but presents it to the government after the government has confirmed the order of detention, the government still has to consider such representation and release the detenu if the detention is not within the power conferred under the statute. **The confirmation of the order of detention is not conclusive as against the detenu. It can be revoked suo motu under Section 11 or upon a representation of the detenu.** It seems to us therefore, that so long as the representation is independently considered by the government and if there is no delay in considering the representation, the fact that it is considered after the confirmation of detention makes little difference on the validity of the detention or confirmation of the detention. The confirmation cannot be invalidated solely on the ground that the representation is considered subsequent to confirmation of the detention. Nor it could be presumed that such consideration is not an independent consideration. With all respect, we are not inclined to subscribe to the views expressed in V.J. Jain [(1979) 4 SCC 401 : 1980 SCC (Cri) 4], Om Prakash Bahl [W.P. No. 845 of 1979, decided on October 15, 1979 (Unreported)] and Khairul Haque cases [W.P. No. 246 of 1969, decided on September 10, 1969 (Unreported)] . They cannot be considered to be good law and hence stand overruled.

22. In ***Rashid Kapadia v. Medha Gadgil***⁴ 1 the Hon'ble Apex Court held that any unreasonable and unexplainable delay in considering the representation is held to be fatal to the continued detention of the detenu. In ***Rashid Kapadia*** (supra) remarks of the sponsoring authority was submitted with a delay of 15 days. Paragraph Nos.12 to 14 in ***Rashid Kapadia*** (supra) reads as under :

“12. It can be seen from the above extracted portion that the first respondent called for the parawise remarks of the sponsoring authority (Customs Department) on 9-8-2011. However, the sponsoring authority responded to the inquiry of the first respondent on 26-8-2011 with a delay of fifteen days. The reasons for such delay have not been explained by the sponsoring authority, represented by the third respondent herein. There is nothing on the record placed before us, which explains the abovementioned delay on the part of the third respondent's Department.

13. It is well settled that the right of a person, who is preventively detained, to make a representation and have it considered by the authority concerned as expeditiously as possible, is a constitutional right under Article 22(5). Any unreasonable and unexplainable delay in considering the representation is held to be fatal to the continued detention of the detenu. The proposition is too well settled in a long line of decisions of this Court. We do not think it necessary to examine the authorities on this aspect, except to take note of a couple of judgments where the principle is discussed in detail. They are: *Mohinuddin v. District Magistrate, Beed* [(1987) 4 SCC 58 : 1987 SCC (Cri) 674] and *Harshala Santosh Patil v. State of Maharashtra* [(2006) 12 SCC 211 : (2007) 1 SCC (Cri) 680] .

14. Therefore, we have no option, but to come to the conclusion that the detention order cannot be sustained on the abovementioned ground alone and it is required to be, accordingly, set aside.”

⁴ (2012) 11 SCC 745

23. Recently, in ***Cheemparthi Shaheen v. the State of Andhra Pradesh (W.P.No.34357 of 2025 dated 01.07.2026)***, this Court on consideration of various pronouncements on the subject of compliance in the cases of ***Rajammal v. State of Tamilnadu and another***⁵, ***Pabitra N.Rana v. Union of India and others***⁶, ***Rashid Kanadia v. Medha Gadgil and others***⁷, ***Abdul Nasar Adam Ismail v. State of Maharashtra***⁸, and ***Ichhu Devi Choraria v. Union of India and others***⁹, held in paragraphs 23 and 24 as under :

“23. It is thus well settled in law that the detenu has a fundamental right to make the representation against his detention order and has a right for its consideration as expeditiously as possible with a sense of urgency without an avoidable delay. Though there is no hard and fast rule with respect to the time and delay but it depends upon the facts and circumstances of each case. In case of delayed disposal of representation the delay must be explained and such explanation must stand the test of reasonableness to the satisfaction of the Court.

24. The representation, even if not filed against the order of detention at the initial stage but is filed after the order of detention has been confirmed by the State still the detenu will have a right to make the representation which survives even after the confirmation of the detention order. The same principle for expeditious disposal of the representation without delay continues to be the fundamental right of the detenu in terms of the law as laid down in the aforesaid judgments in view of Articles 21 and 22 (5) of the Constitution of India. So delay in disposal of the representation even after the order of detention has been confirmed by the State must be justified by giving proper and sufficient explanation. If there is no sufficient explanation or a Court finds delay unreasonable and

⁵ (1999) 1 SCC 417

⁶ (1980) 2 SCC 338

⁷ (2012) 11 SCC 745

⁸ (2013) 4 SCC 435

⁹ (1980) 4 SCC 531

is not satisfied on the grounds for delay, the continued detention would become illegal. The order of detention on such ground would not be illegal or void but pursuant to that order of detention, the detenu cannot be detained any further. Any unexplained delay in the disposal of representation would be a breach of the constitutional imperative and it would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal.”

24. In the present case, no satisfactory explanation is forthcoming for the considerable delay between the submission of the representation on 01.03.2026 and the submission of remarks by the District Collector only on 07.07.2026, followed by the rejection of the representation on 14.07.2026. The explanation that the delay occurred on account of the belated submission of remarks does not, by itself, satisfactorily explain the delay, particularly when the representation concerns the personal liberty of the detenu and is required to be dealt with as soon as possible. In the absence of a satisfactory explanation for the delay, the continued detention of the detenu cannot be sustained.

25. There is delay in considering the petitioner's representation, and there is no explanation for the delay, the continued preventive detention of the detenu becomes illegal, and he is entitled to be released, if he is not in detention in any other pending criminal case.

26. The writ petition is **allowed**, setting aside the impugned order of preventive detention by the 2nd respondent-Collector & District Magistrate, Nellore Town at S.P.S.Nellore District, passed against the detenu, *vide* proceedings in **Rc.C1/(Magl)/06/2025**, dated **19.01.2026**, the order of

confirmation by the State *vide* **G.O.Rt.No.546**, General Administration (SC-I) Department, dated **11.03.2026**, so also the order of rejection of representation by the State *vide* **G.O.Rt.No.1384**, General Administration (SC-I) Department, dated **14.07.2026** and rejection order of another representation dated 28.07.2026, *vide* **G.O.Rt.No.1796**, General Administration (SC-I) Department, dated **15.09.2026**. The detenu by name Sri Talasila Venkata Narasimha Rao, s/o Sambashiva Rao, age 52 yrs, N/o Nagayalanka village and Mandal, Krishna District, now residing at Gattupalli, Chinthalapelm village, Jaladanki Mandal, SPS Nellore District, Andhra Pradesh, shall be released/set free forthwith, if not detained in any other pending criminal case.

No order as to costs.

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

RAVI NATH TILHARI, J

SUNITHA GANDHAM, J

Date : **24.09.2026**

Note :- L.R. Copy to be marked.

B/o
RPD.

Whether the order is :

Speaking	✓ Yes/ No	Reasoned	✓ Yes/ No
Reportable	✓ Yes/ No	Non-Reportable	Yes/ No

21

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
AND
THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE SUNITHA GANDHAM

(ALLOWED)

WRIT PETITION NO: 10194 of 2026

Date: 24.09.2026

Note :- L.R. Copy to be marked.

B/o
RPD.

*** THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI**

*** THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE SUNITHA GANDHAM**

+ WRIT PETITION NO: 10194 OF 2026

% 24.09.2026

Smt.Talasila Santhi.

.....Petitioner

And:

\$ The State of Andhra Pradesh,
Rep. by its Chief Secretary and others

....Respondents.

!Counsel for the petitioner : Sri Gudapati Venkateswara Rao

^Counsel for the respondents : Sri Akula Venkata Sai Jagadeesh,
learned Assistant Government Pleader attached to the office of learned AG

<Gist:

>Head Note:

? Cases referred:

1. 2019 (20) SCC 609
2. (1989) 3 SCC 173
3. (1991) 1 SCC 476
4. (2012) 11 SCC 745
5. (1999) 1 SCC 417
6. (1980) 2 SCC 338
7. (2012) 11 SCC 745
8. (2013) 4 SCC 435
9. (1980) 4 SCC 531

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

* * * *

WRIT PETITION NO: 10194 OF 2026**DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 24.09.2026****SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:****THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI****&****THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE SUNITHA GANDHAM**

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. <i>Whether Reporters of Local newspapers may be allowed to see the Judgments?</i> | Yes/No |
| 2. <i>Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reporters/Journals</i> | Yes/No |
| 3. <i>Whether Your Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment?</i> | Yes/No |

RAVI NATH TILHARI,J

SUNITHA GANDHAM, J