

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA  
AT HYDERABAD**

MONDAY, THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF APRIL  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**:PRESENT:**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B.VIJAYSEN REDDY  
WP NO: 11308 OF 2026**

**Between**

M.A.Shareef, S/o. Late Md. Khasim Ali. ✓

**.....PETITIONER**

**AND**

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Chief Secretary, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad, Telangana State. ✓
2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad, Telangana State. ✓
3. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, M.A. and U.D. (Municipal Administration and Urban Development Department), Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad, Telangana State. ✓
4. The Commissioner, HYDRAA, 7- Floor, Budha Bhavan, Ranigunj, Secunderabad 500003 ✓
5. Bala Gopal, Inspector, HYDRAA, 7- Floor, Budha Bhavan, Ranigunj, Secunderabad - 500003 ✓
6. Rajashekar, Inspector, HYDRAA, 7- Floor, Budha Bhavan, Ranigunj, Secunderabad - 500003 ✓
7. Tahsildar (Revenue), HYDRAA Officer, 7- floor, Buddha Bhavan, Ranigunj, Secunderabad ✓
8. The District Collector, Sangareddy District, Sangareddy, Telangana State. ✓
9. The Joint Collector, Sangareddy District, Sangareddy, Telangana State. ✓
10. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Sangareddy Revenue Division, Sangareddy District, Telangana State. ✓
11. The Tahsildar/Mandal Revenue Officer, Ameenpur Mandal, Sangareddy District, Telangana State. ✓
12. The Revenue Inspector, Ameenpur Mandal, Sangareddy District ✓
13. The District Panchayat Officer, Sangareddy District, Sangareddy, Telangana State. ✓

14. The Ameenpur Municipality, Ameenpur Mandal, Sangareddy District, Telangana State, Rep. by its Commissioner. ✓
15. Deputy Commissioner of Police, Serilingampally Zone, Cyberabad ✓
16. Assistant Commissioner of Police, Serilingampally Division, Cyberabad ✓
17. The Station House Officer, Ameenpur Police Station, Ameenpur, Cyberabad ✓
18. The Sub-Inspector of Police, Ameenpur Police Station, Ameenpur, Cyberabad ✓

**.....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 issue any appropriate Writ, Order or direction, preferably a writ in the nature of Mandamus a. declaring the high-handed action of the respondents, specifically Respondent No.04 in illegally and unlawfully interfering with the ownership and peaceful possession of the Petitioner in respect of patta land in Sy.Nos. 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 212, 213, total admeasuring Ac 36.37 Gts, situated at Ailapur Village, Ameenpur Mandal, Sangareddy District and demolition of the petitioners house containing electronic appliances, gold ornaments, crockery, furniture, gas cylinders and fixtures, ancestral house dating over a 100 years, godown leased to small business owner, structure leased to a cement bricks industry run by a small business owner, office outhouse, servant quarters, main gates, security room, swimming pool, 50,000 liters overhead water tank, complete boundary wall with compound wall, staple housing 3 horses, small-shed housing a number of cocks and hens, electricity poles, transformer, bores, trees (mango, sapota, papaya, coconut, Indian gooseberry, neem, jamun, shrubs and herbs), box-cricket play area, tractor, agricultural produce, 12 CCTVs cameras along with NVR, in Sy.Nos. 175 (Part) and 173 (Part), situated at Ailapur Village, Ameenpur Mandal, Sangareddy District and highhandedly laying a fence around the petitioners patta property, as being wholly illegal, arbitrary, perverse, unconstitutional, violative of principles of natural justice and grossly violative of Articles 14, 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India, and utter disregard of the law laid down by this Hon'ble Court as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, and set aside the same b. Consequently, direct the respondents herein to restore the demolished structure(s) such as, the petitioners house, ancestral house dating over a 100 years, godown leased to small business owner, structure leased to a cement bricks industry run by a small business owner, office outhouse, servant quarters, main gates, security room, swimming pool, 50,000 liters overhead water tank, complete boundary wall with compound wall, staple housing 3 horses, small-shed housing a number of cocks and hens, electricity poles, transformer, bores, trees (mango, sapota, papaya, coconut, Indian gooseberry, neem, jamun, shrubs and herbs), box-cricket play area, tractor, agricultural produce, 12 CCTV cameras along with NVR, constructed in a patta land in Sy.Nos. 175 (Part) and 173 (Part), situated at Ailapur Village, Ameenpur Mandal, Sangareddy District.

**I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026**

Petition under Section 151 of C.P.C praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the respondents herein specifically 4<sup>th</sup> Respondent- HYDRAA to not

interfere with the ownership and peaceful possession of the petitioner's property in patta land in Sy.Nos. 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 212, 213, total admeasuring Ac 36.37 Gts, situated at Ailapur Village, Ameenpur Mandal, Sangareddy District and forthwith remove already erected fencing and restrict from further laying of the fencing in patta land in Sy.Nos. 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 212, 213, total admeasuring Ac 36.37 Gts, situated at Ailapur Village, Ameenpur Mandal, Sangareddy District by not altering the nature of the land, pending disposal of the main writ petition and pass, Pending disposal of WP No 11308 of 2026, on the file of the High Court.

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the petition and the affidavit filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of Mr. L. Ravi Chander Senior Counsel for M/s. Deepak Misra Advocate for the Petitioner and Mr. Md. Imran Khan Additional Advocate General for the respondent Nos.1 to 13,15 to 18 and Mr. Putta Krishna Reddy Standing Counsel for Municipalities for respondent No.14, the Court made the following.

### **ORDER**

**Heard Mr. L. Ravi Chander, learned Senior Counsel, appearing for Mr. Deepak Misra, learned counsel for the petitioner; Mr. Md. Imran Khan, learned Additional Advocate General; and Mr. Putta Krishna Reddy, learned Standing Counsel for Municipalities, appearing for respondent No.14.**

**Learned Additional Advocate General submitted that in the guise of the decree dated 01.04.2009 passed in O.S.No.36 of 2006 in the Court of the Special Judge for Trial of Offences under SC/ST (POA) Act-cum-V Additional District and Sessions Judge, Medak at Sanga Reddy, over an extent of the land admeasuring Acs.36-37 guntas in Survey Nos.165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 212 and 213 situated at Ailapur Village, Patancheru Mandal, Medak District, the petitioner is trying to grab about more than thousand acres of the Government land. The building which is demolished by HYDRAA was constructed in the Government land. The building does not have any building permission or electricity permission. None of the structures raised in the property in question were constructed by obtaining any building permission.**

**Learned Senior Counsel submitted that the building which was demolished, as evident from the photographs filed at page Nos.221 and 222 of the writ papers, forms part of the schedule property in O.S.No.36 of 2006, wherein contested decree was passed. The suit was filed by the petitioner against the Government of Andhra Pradesh represented by the District Collector, Medak, and the Mandal Revenue Officer, Patancheru Mandal. When there was interference by the respondent authorities in the year 2024, the petitioner filed W.P.No.26677 of 2024, wherein order dated**

25.09.2024 was passed by this Court directing the respondents not to take any coercive action for removal of the constructions existing as on date in the subject land, without following due process of law.

Learned Senior Counsel submitted that the HYDRAA officials, assisted by several personnel, came to the site of the petitioner on 11.04.2026 at 4.00 A.M and demolished the building. It is submitted that the building was constructed as per the sanctioned plan of Ailapur *vide* proceedings No.GC/50/2005 dated 25.03.2005 (Ex.P12 filed at page No.174), and the allegation made by the respondents that the building is constructed without sanctioned plan is on the face of record incorrect.

The video clippings of the demolition activity also have been displayed before the Court, from which it can be seen that hundreds of personnel belonging to HYDRAA wearing blue uniform have assembled at the site. Massive building of the petitioner is demolished. It appears, no prior notice was issued to the petitioner by any of the respondent authorities including HYDRAA before undertaking this demolition exercise.

It needs to be noted that the submission made by the respondent authorities has been recorded by a coordinate Bench of this Court in the order dated 25.09.2024 in W.P.No.26677 of 2024 referring to the order dated 17.09.2024 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in WP (Civil) No.295 of 2022, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court clarified that directions issued to the authorities to carry out demolition subject to certain guidelines and by following due process of law would not be applicable if there is unauthorized structure in any public place such as road, street, footpath, abutting railway line or any river body or water bodies and also to cases where there is an order for demolition made by a Court of law.

It is shocking to see that demolition of a huge structure is made without any prior notice. Assuming that the petitioner has constructed the building without sanctioned plan, it is surprising to note as to how the authorities permitted construction of such a huge structure. Things could have been in place if action had been taken at the inception, when unauthorized construction was noticed and subsequently prevented. Instead, the authorities, having blindfolded themselves and having allowed a huge structure to come up, now complain before the Court that the construction was made without any sanctioned plan.

Be that as it may, it is settled law that principles of natural justice are required to be followed when any building, be it unauthorized, is demolished. It appears from the photographs and the video clippings that the subject building is a farm house constructed in a huge extent of land. There is also a water tank. It is painful to see demolition of such a massive structure being carried out without issuing any notice. The manner in

which the HYDRAA officials assembled at the site and created hype of the situation, according to the learned Senior Counsel, is akin to a war-like situation, and the same cannot be countenanced. The HYDRAA is bound by certain rules and guidelines. Despite several orders passed by this Court, HYDRAA continues to indulge in unauthorized and high-handed actions. Thus, it is necessary for this Court to come down heavily upon HYDRAA and its actions.

On seeing the photographs and the video clippings, this Court is of *prima facie* opinion that HYDRAA is not following any standard procedures. No doubt, the Hon'ble Apex Court, in WP (Civil) No.295 of 2022, *vide* order dated 17.09.2024, specifically clarified that directions issued to the authorities to carry out demolition subject to certain guidelines and by following due process of law would not be applicable if there is unauthorized structure in any public place such as road, street, footpath, abutting railway line or any river body or water bodies and also to cases where there is an order for demolition made by a Court of law. In cases where there is dispute regarding title or parties are in long standing possession of the property, as in the instant case where huge structure is constructed, it needs no emphasis that HYDRAA is required to issue notice.

As seen from several cases filed before this Court, HYDRAA is trying to justify its action contending that demolitions are undertaken on the request of private individuals and in public interest. HYDRAA takes pride in claiming that it has restored several water bodies in and around Hyderabad. The fact that hundreds of cases have been filed in this Court complaining high-handed action of HYDRAA is a sufficient indication that actions of HYDRAA to say the least are not in proper direction. However, this Court is not inclined to make any general observations. This Court has heard several cases complaining high-handed and arbitrary action of HYDRAA.

It has been contended by the learned Standing Counsel for HYDRAA and also the learned Additional Advocate General that on the requisition given by the local authorities/Municipalities/Municipal Corporation and the complaints of layout/plot owners alleging encroachment of parks, open spaces and areas earmarked for public utilities, water bodies, etc., the HYDRAA has stepped into action and demolished/removed unauthorized structures. This Court has heard not less than 100 matters where the HYDRAA is the respondent. In none of such cases, the HYDRAA has followed any standard procedure. Even after one year of HYDRAA's existence, it is still not known whether HYDRAA is following the provisions of the Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation Act (for short 'GHMC Act') or the Municipalities Act. It has been the consistent case of the respondent authorities and the learned Additional Advocate General that

HYDRAA has been delegated power under Section 374-B of the GHMC Act and several G.Os have been issued extending the jurisdiction of HYDRAA to undertake demolition activities and to protect the Government lands/public roads/parks vested in the local authorities and the jurisdiction of HYDRAA has been extended to areas within outer ring road. As observed above, there is no standard procedure being followed by HYDRAA, and the actions of HYDRAA are inconsistent with the established procedure under law and the principles of natural justice.

Hence, *status quo*, obtaining as on today, shall be maintained in respect of the subject property until further orders.

HYDRAA is directed not to undertake any activity relating to demolition or removal of unauthorized construction at any place/site, except for removal of encroachments and the restoration of water bodies, NALAs, parks and public roads. No coercive action relating to unauthorized construction, internal roads, removal of compound walls, etc., shall be undertaken by HYDRAA unless HYDRAA places before this Court the standard operating procedures or guidelines in accordance with the provisions of the GHMC Act, the Municipalities Act, or other applicable regulations/rules.

Post on 20.04.2026.

Sd/- P.PONNA KRISHNA  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

  
SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Chief Secretary, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad, State of Telangana, Telangana State.
2. The Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad, State of Telangana, Telangana State.
3. The Principal Secretary, M.A. and U.D. (Municipal Administration and Urban Development Department), Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad, State of Telangana, Telangana State.
4. The Commissioner, HYDRAA, 7- Floor, Budha Bhavan, Ranigunj, Secunderabad 500003
5. Bala Gopal, Inspector, HYDRAA, 7- Floor, Budha Bhavan, Ranigunj, Secunderabad - 500003
6. Rajashekar Inspector, HYDRAA, 7- Floor, Budha Bhavan, Ranigunj, Secunderabad - 500003
7. Tahsildar (Revenue), HYDRAA Officer, 7- floor, Buddha Bhavan, Ranigunj, Secunderabad
8. The District Collector, Sangareddy District, Sangareddy, Telangana State.

9. The Joint Collector, Sangareddy District, Sangareddy, Telangana State.
  10. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Sangareddy Revenue Division, Sangareddy District, Telangana State.
  11. The Tahsildar/Mandal Revenue Officer, Ameenpur Mandal, Sangareddy District, Telangana State.
  12. The Revenue Inspector, Ameenpur Mandal, Sangareddy District
  13. The District Panchayat Officer, Sangareddy District, Sangareddy, Telangana State.
  14. The Commissioner, Ameenpur Municipality, Ameenpur Mandal, Sangareddy District, Telangana State.
  15. Deputy Commissioner of Police, Serilingampally Zone, Cyberabad
  16. Assistant Commissioner of Police, Serilingampally Division, Cyberabad
  17. The Station House Officer, Ameenpur Police Station, Ameenpur, Cyberabad
  18. The Sub-Inspector of Police, Ameenpur Police Station, Ameenpur, Cyberabad
- [Addresses 1 to 18 by SPAD]**
19. One CC to M/s. DEEPAK MISRA Advocate [OPUC]
  20. Two CCs to GP FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATION, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT]
  21. One spare copy

**HIGH COURT**

**BVR, J**

**DATED: 13-04-2026**

**POST ON 20.04.2026**



**ORDER**

**WP.No.11308 of 2026**

**STATUS QUO**