

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

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K. LAKSHMAN

WRIT PETITION No.17839 OF 2024
(CNR No.HBHC010344042024)

AND

CONTEMPT CASE No.1435 OF 2024
(CNR No.HBHC010378492024)

Reserved on: 19.06.2026

Pronounced on: 03-09-2026

Uploaded on : 05-09-2026

Between:

Manik Rao

.. Petitioner

Vs

The State of Telangana rep. by its Prl.
Secretary, Revenue Dept., Hyderabad & others

.. Respondents

This Court delivered the following:

COMMON ORDER:

Heard Mr. M.S. Anwar Siddiqui, learned counsel for the petitioner, Ms. Tekuru Swetcha, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue and Mr. K. Jaya Kumar and Mr. Ch. Venkat Raman, learned counsel appearing for the unofficial respondents in W.P.No.17839 of 2024.

2. The writ petition is filed to declare the action of respondent Nos.1 to 4 herein in deleting Sy.Nos.110 and 131 of Rompally village,

Bantwaram Mandal, Vikarabad District, without issuing prior notice to the registered holders in the Record of Rights by contravening principles of natural justice, *audi alteram partem*, as illegal and consequently to direct the respondent Nos.1 to 4 to sign them up, add them in Dharani Portal in its original position as on the date of 30.01.2024.

3. The petitioner is claiming that the land to an extent of Acs.14-27 guntas in Sy.Nos.110 and 131, situated at Rompally Village, Bantwaram Mandal, Vikarabad District (for short, 'the subject property') was allotted to his father's share by virtue of family partition dated 09.04.1972. The petitioner, his sister-in-law and his brothers i.e. respondent Nos.6 to 8, are legal heirs of his father late Sri Manohar Rao. They were given e-passbooks in the LRUP (Land Records Updation Programme) conducted by Telangana State and in pursuance of the directions of the Government that the lands should not be kept in the names of the dead persons. The petitioner was also given e-pass book for his 1/4th share. He is in physical possession and enjoyment of the said lands since 1972 onwards and till date. The official respondents have, un-signed the subject survey numbers in

Dharani Portal, without notice to him and his family members, in contravention of Section 7 of the Telangana Rights In Land And Pattadar Pass Books Act, (Act,9 of 2020) 2020 (for short, 'the Act, 2020') w.e.f.29.10.2020.

4. Respondent No.5 has gone in adoption to the family of Kotapalli Kishan Rao and had got lands in Kotapalli Village. It is settled legal position held by Three Judge Bench of this Court in **Anumolu Nageswara Rao v. AVRI Narasimha Rao [2023 (5) ALD 716 (TS)]** that on adoption, a child ceases to be coparcener of family of his birth and forgoes interest in ancestral property in family of his birth. Respondent No.5 has suppressed the fact *ab-initio* in all the proceedings and obtained fraudulent orders. The said proceedings are nullity and *non-est* under law. The actual heirs and legal representatives i.e. natural brothers of respondent No.5 i.e., Mr. Rajaram Rao and Mr. Ravinder Rao, have consistently gave their statements before the Revenue authorities that subject lands were allotted to the father of the petitioner i.e. Sri Manohar Rao, younger brother of their father late Sri Vithal Rao and that after the death of

petitioner's father, the said property devolved on the petitioner, his brothers and sisters-in-law.

5. Pursuant to the common order dated 01.02.2022 in W.P.Nos.6107 and 28211 of 2019, respondent No.5 got deleted names of his father and brothers from the possession column. Respondent No.5 got order dated 01.02.2022 by misleading the Court that the subsequent action of the authorities pursuant to the order dated 20.06.2015 passed by Lokayukta are under challenge, which led to miscarriage of justice.

6. On 15.03.2022, respondent No.5 herein filed a petition in I.A. No.1 of 2022 to review the order dated 01.02.2022 in W.P.No. 6107 of 2019 and the same is pending. The matter is *sub judice* and has not attained finality. Suppressing the pendency of said review petition, respondent No.5 herein, filed two writ petitions and two Contempt Cases i.e. (i) W.P. No. 19757 of 2022 filed with regard to same subject matter but only against official respondents herein, without making the unofficial respondents in the said W.P. Nos. 6107 and 28211 of 2019 as parties. This Court disposed of the said writ petition vide order dated 03.04.2023 directing the Collector,

Vikarabad to conduct enquiry and pass reasoned orders after giving notice to the unofficial respondents in W.P. Nos. 6107 and 28211 of 2019.

7. In the said W.P. No. 19757 of 2022, this Court was misled by respondent No.5 that the orders in W.P. Nos. 6107 of 2019 and 28211 of 2019 have attained finality. This Court specifically recorded the same in its orders. Thus, the said orders were fraudulent by suppressing stage of the case.

8. Respondent No.5 also filed a writ petition in W.P.No.2155 of 2024 on 25.01.2024 assailing the order of the Collector, Vikarabad District in File No. E2.724 of 2023 dated 13.12.2023 in compliance of order in W.P.No.19757 of 2022, without mentioning about pendency of Rev.I.A.No.1 of 2022 to review the orders in W.P.No.6107 of 2019. This Court granted status quo in W.P.No.2155 of 2024 vide order dated 30.01.2024 and thereafter the same was extended. On 27.01.2024, he filed C.C.No.153 of 2024 in W.P.No.19757 of 2022 against the Collector, Vikarabad District without mentioning about the pendency of the said review petition. He got orders in the said C.C.No.153 2024 by suppressing the fact of filing of W.P.No.2155 of

2024. It was misrepresented to the Court that the petitioner is intending to challenge the said rejection orders and addressed a letter dated 22.02.2024 to the Registrar (Judicial) to the said effect.

9. As on 01.03.2024 and also on 22.02.2022, W.P.No.2155 was already filed and was pending and the interim order were also in force, as such, the question of the petitioner intending to challenge the said rejection orders, did not arise.

10. On 05.03.2024, after two years from the date of the orders dated 01.02.2022, respondent No.5 filed C.C.No.485 of 2024 against the Collector, Vikarabad District wherein also the pendency of Rev.I.A.No.1 of 2022 is not mentioned.

11. Common order is dated 01.02.2022. Review petition in I.A.No.1 of 2022 in W.P.No.6107 of 2019 was filed on 15.03.2022. As on the date of filing of C.C.No.485 of 2024 i.e. 05.03.2024, the contempt case was *prima facie*, barred by limitation and was not maintainable, being filed after two years from the date of common order dated 01.02.2022 and in the interregnum period, respondent No.5 submitted several applications through Mee Seva, for correction, even after obtaining interim orders dated 30.01.2024. Therefore,

respondent No.5 and his counsel are repeatedly misleading the Court and obtaining orders by playing fraud. The official respondents are also sailing with respondent No.5 neglecting the status quo orders dated 30.01.2024. It was misrepresented in C.C.No.485 of 2024 that the Court gave liberty to the writ petitioner to file fresh contempt against the orders in C.C.No.153 of 2024. In fact, the Court has not granted any such liberty to file fresh contempt.

12. The official respondents deliberately disobeyed the orders of this Court in W.P.No.2155 of 2024 and have deleted subject survey numbers, from Dharani Portal and caused miscarriage of justice. Up to 17.04.2024, their names were there in Dharani Portal but on 23.04.2024, their names were unsigned without issuance of notice to them. Entering the name of respondent No.5 clearly amounts to tampering the record of rights. It is settled law that the fraudulent orders can be assailed even in collateral proceedings.

13. In the common order dated 01.02.2022, the rights of respondent No.5 are not confirmed. As per Section 7 of the Act, 2020, it empowers a person who acquires right by decree of a Court and seeks to change the entries in Record of Rights by applying

through the website prescribed for this purpose. The order dated 01.02.2022 is not a decree to entitle respondent No.5 to seek any changes in the admitted revenue records, as none is a decree holder nor judgment debtor to entertain any application under Section 7 of the Act, 2020. This Court in the said common order, held that the Court is not intended to comment anything upon the revenue entries which were existing prior to passing of the order by the Lokayukta and therefore, the parties shall be free to take recourse to the legal remedies available under the law.

14. Respondent No.5 herein and his counsel with their deliberate suppression of facts, misrepresentation, misleading statements, adopting forum shopping and playing fraud upon the Court, expanded the scope and filed multiple writ petitions, both prior to 2019 and after 2019.

15. He has placed reliance on the principle laid down by the Apex Court in **S. P. Chegalvaraya Naidu (dead) by L.Rs. v. Jagannath (Dead) by L.Rs¹, State of A.P. v. T. Suryachandra Rao², Badami (deceased) by her L.R. v. Bhali³, Ramchandra**

¹. (1994) 1 SCC 1

². (2005) 5 SCC 149

Singh v. Savitri Devi⁴, Bhaurao Dagdu Paralkar v. State of Maharashtra⁵, judgment of this Court in Visweswara Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. v. Telangana State Industrial Infrastructure Corporation Ltd, Hyderabad⁶ and the judgment of erstwhile High Court of Andhra Pradesh in A.V. Papaya Sastry v. Government of A.P⁷.

16. Respondent No.6 filed counter denying the claim of the petitioner and contended that she and respondent No.8 are cultivating their agricultural lands. They are all entitled to reliefs as heirs and legal representatives of late Sri Manohar Rao. To protect their rights over the properties covered under the writ petition, on 16.02.2022, she complained to the official respondents including the CCLA, the Chief Secretary and the Chief Minister to take action but the official respondents did not entertain the said complaint. Due to change of officials and the government in the State of Telangna, the revenue officials in collusion with respondent No.5, tampered the revenue records. The official respondents have no right to give away their

³. (2012) 11 SCC 574

⁴. (2003) 8 SCC 319

⁵. (2005) 7 SCC 605

⁶. 2023 (5) ALD 316 (DB)

⁷. 2007 (6) ALD 68 (SC)

property, as they being registered holders and having e-pass books, without issuing notice to them. They ignored her complaint dated 16.02.2022. There was no change in situations or circumstances from 16.02.2022 to mid-April, 2024. The sons of late Sri Vithal Rao, i.e. Mr. Rajaram Rao @ Raju and Ravinder Rao @ Ravi, the real and actual heirs and legal representatives, are not parties of the dispute till this date. Respondent No.5 does not belong to their family having gone in adoption.

17. The real and actual heirs of late Sri. Vithal Rao, admitted the partition, allotment of share to her father-in-law and have already given their sworn statements, declarations and letters, etc., in the Police and Revenue Department as well as in Court, and also even during making entries in Dharani portal about 6 or 7 years ago in the revenue records updation undertaken by the Government of Telangana. After due enquiry in Tahsildar Office, Revenue Divisional Office, Collector Office, only, proceedings were issued to them and their names were entered in the revenue records and e-pass books were also issued in the year 2019 and they are getting Rythu Bandhu too. They are raising crops in the subject property. As respondent

No.5 is not their family member, he is not connected with their properties. He got lands in Kotapally Village. His claim is totally based on collusion, fraud, cheating and manipulation of records. Therefore, she seeks to grant the same relief as sought in the writ petition.

18. Respondent Nos.9 to 11 filed counter denying the allegations made by the petitioner and contended that originally, one Sri Vittal Rao S/o Khande Rao is the actual owner and possessor of the subject property, as per the revenue records. After demise of the said Vittal Rao, the names of his legal representatives were mutated in the revenue records vide proceedings dated B/424/2007, dated 17.03.2007 and the same was continued up to the year 2015. Aggrieved by the above entries, husband of respondent No.9 i.e., respondent No.5 along with several others approached the Lokayukta and obtained a common order dated 20.06.2015 in Complaint Nos.2557/2011/B1 and 3, the names of the petitioner and respondent Nos.6 to 8 herein were incorporated in revenue records duly removing her husband/respondent No.5's name from the revenue records. Aggrieved by the revenue entries made in the revenue records

pursuant to the orders dated 20.06.2015, her husband filed W.P.Nos.6107 and 28211 of 20189. This Court vide order dated 01.02.2022 set aside the order dated 20.06.2015 and all subsequent orders/accused pursuant to the aforesaid order passed by the Lokayukta. Thereafter, her husband/respondent No.5 filed W.P.No.19757 of 2022 to restore the entries in the revenue records relating to the subject property, in terms of common order dated 01.02.2022 in W.P.No.28211 and 6107 of 2019, and the same was disposed of vide order dated 03.04.2023 directing respondent No.3 therein to consider the online application, issuance of e-pattadar passbook, and pass orders strictly in accordance with law by putting the petitioner and the unofficial respondents in W.P.Nos.28211 and 6107 of 2019 on notice and affording them an opportunity. Thereafter, respondent No.5 filed C.C.No.485 of 2024 against the orders in W.P.No.28211 of 2019. In compliance with the common orders dated 01.02.2022, the revenue authorities have processed the online application of her husband and restored revenue entries prior to the impugned Lokayukta order dated 20.06.2015. Pursuant to the said orders, the District Collector, took up the matter on record and issued notices to all the interested parties and passed order dated 13.12.2023

holding that there is dispute about partition of lands among family members, the said court has no jurisdiction on civil disputes/family disputes, and advised the parties to approach competent Court for redressal of their dispute.

19. Aggrieved by the said order, respondent No.5 filed W.P.No.2155 of 2024, wherein this Court passed interim order dated 30.01.2024 granting *status quo* and the petitioner herein and the respondent Nos.6 to 8 were also parties to the said writ petition and all of them have filed their counters in the said writ petition and the said interim order was extended up to 12.03.2024, while that was so, the respondent Nos.7 and 9 therein/respondent Nos.6 and 8 herein, have filed contempt case vide C.C.No.1379 of 2024 against the status quo order 30.01.2024 against the petitioner and respondent No.5, who filed counter in the said CC. This Court vide order dated 25.08.2025 held that the Court is not inclined to entertain the contempt case and closed the same. However, liberty was granted to the petitioner and Mr. Manik Rao - respondent No.6 therein –party-in-person, to pursue review application in W.P.No.6107 of 2019 and also in W.P.No.2155 of 2024.

20. The revenue authorities have corrected the entries, recorded name of respondent No.5 and issued E-pattadar pass books in their favour. While the subject matter is pending and subjudice before this Court, the Petitioner has filed the present writ petition alleging that the revenue authorities without issuing any prior notice to him, deleted his name in revenue records. In fact, the revenue authorities have issued notices to all the interested persons, called for enquiry and on clarification of the subject land, passed order dated 13.12.2023 and the petitioner and respondent No. 6 to 8 are well aware of the proceedings.

21. While the matter stood thus, in view of closing of C.C.No. 1379 of 2024, dated 25.08.2025, respondent Nos.6 and 8 herein have filed Letters Patent Appeal vide LPA. No. 15 of 2025 and on hearing, the Division Bench of this Court, vide order dated 12.02.2026 dismissed the said LPA, holding that there is no deliberate attempt on the part of respondent No.1 therein in flouting the order of the learned Single Judge dated 30.01.2024, more so, there was no subsisting of any interim order as on the date of restoration of entries i.e. on 08.07.2024. The learned Single Judge has considered all the issues in

a proper perspective and it does not require any interference. Liberty is also granted to the parties to ventilate their grievances in the pending proceedings before this Court. There is no *status quo* while restoring entries in the revenue records and the revenue authorities have also issued proceedings, dated 08.07.2024 for restoration of entries and also issued pattadar passbooks to respondent No.5. Unless and until there is no violation of the orders of the Court, there is a clear title in favour of respondent No.5. The petitioner and respondent Nos.6 to 8 though not have right and title over the subject land, filed complaints before relevant authorities.

C.C.No.1435 of 2024:

22. This contempt case is filed by the petitioner alleging wilful disobedience and gross violation of the orders dated 09.07.2024 passed in W.P.No.17839 of 2024 (present writ petition) by this Court by the respondents herein/respondent Nos.2 and 4 in the writ petition. Vide the aforesaid order, this Court directed the petitioner and respondent Nos.2, 4, 5 to 8 to maintain status quo, with regard to the entries in the revenue records in respect of the subject property, till 20.08.2024.

23. It is contended by the petitioner that the respondents herein have violated the orders dated 09.07.2024 and entered the name of respondent No.5 in respect of Sy.No.131 only on 11.07.2024. Even as on 10.07.2024, night at 11.45 p.m., the status of entries in Dharani Portal had shown both the survey numbers, as unsigned. On 11.07.2025, there was entry of name of respondent No.5 against the Sy.No.131, leaving Sy.No.110. Thus, the respondents herein have committed willful disobedience and gross violation of the order dated 09.07.2024.

24. Respondent No.2 filed counter, adverting to the averments made by the petitioner and narrating the filing of various cases, contending that the petitioner himself has also admitted in W.P.No.17839 of 2024 that the revenue entries were already restored by 09.07.2024, the date of interim order. Therefore, there is no question of violation of said interim order. The interim order is dated 09.07.2024, dispatched on 12.07.2024 whereas the revenue entries were restored on 08.07.2024. They came to know about the interim order in W.P.No.17839 of 2024 after approval by the District Collector on 08.07.2024 of online application filed by respondent

No.5. There is no violation much less willful violation of the orders of the Court. With the above submissions, he sought to close the contempt.

25. In view of the aforesaid rival submissions, it is the specific case of the petitioner that his father was allotted the subject lands in a partition took place on 09.04.1972. Since then, his father was in possession and enjoyment of the subject lands, his name was also recorded in revenue records under possession column and was issued pattadar passbook. In 1999-00 and 2001-02, the names of his father and elder brother were deleted from possession column and the name of father of respondent No.5 was incorporated by tampering the records. The then VRO, Sri Bugga Rao, was also dismissed. The said entries tampered were set aside by the RDO, Vikarabad in 2007. However, finally the names of legal heirs of his father including himself were incorporated in revenue records. Respondent No.5 went in adoption and, therefore, he has no right, title or interest over the subject lands as the moment when he went to adoption, he ceases to be their family member. Challenging the entries of the father of the petitioner and his elder brother made in revenue records, respondent

No.5 also approached the Revenue Authorities as well as before this Court.

26. Perusal of record would reveal that Mr. Manohar Rao, father of the petitioner, Mr. Vithal Rao, father of respondent No.5 and Mr. Rama Rao are own brothers and are the sons of Kande Rao. There was a partition said to have taken place among them on 09.04.1972. According to the petitioner, as per the said partition, the subject lands were allotted to his father. Basing on the said partition, the names of his father and his elder brother were recorded in revenue records and since then they were in possession and enjoyment of the same. Perusal of pahani patriks filed by the petitioner would disclose the same.

27. The petitioner herein, respondent Nos.7 and 8 and the husband of respondent No.6 are the sons of late Manohar Rao. Respondent No.5, Mr. Raja Ram Rao and Mr. R. Ravinder Rao are the sons of late R. Vittal Rao. During pendency of the present writ petition, respondent No.5 died and his wife and children are brought on record as respondent Nos.9 to 11.

28. It appears respondent No.5 and his 2 brothers gave a joint affidavit before the Mandal Revenue Officer, Bantwaram Mandal, to mutate their names in respect of the subject lands. In the said affidavit, they did not mention with regard to the partition said to have taken place among his father, father of the petitioner and their uncle. On the other hand, they requested the MRO to mutate their names in respect of subject lands in the manner mentioned therein i.e., Sy.No.131, admeasuring Acs.14.27 guntas situated at Rompally Village in favour of respondent No.5 herein, the land in Survey No.10 admeasuring Acs.2.20 guntas in favour of Mr. R. Raja Ram Rao and the land in Survey No.110 admeasuring Acs.2.20 guntas in favour of Mr. R. Ravinder Rao. Pursuant to the said joint affidavit, the then Tahsildar granted succession mutating their names in the said manner, *vide* order dated 17.03.2007 in Proceedings No.B/424/2007. Challenging the same, the petitioner herein preferred an appeal before the Revenue Divisional Officer, Vikarabad Division under Section - 5 (5) of ROR Act, 1971 in File No.C/1047/2007. *Vide* order dated 02.07.2007, the RDO set aside the said proceedings dated 17.03.2007, directing the Tahsildar to consider the case afresh duly following the procedure.

29. Thereafter, respondent No.8 made a representation dated 01.07.2010 to the Tahsildar, Bantwaram Mandal, with a request to note down physical features, conduct enquiry as to who are in physical possession of the subject lands and made entries to that effect in revenue records. It appears that in the said enquiry, the other two brothers of respondent No.5 i.e., Mr. R. Rajaram Rao and Mr. R. Ravinder Rao gave sworn statements on 28.08.2010 before the Tahsildar, Bantwaram Mandal in Case No.B/4273/2010. In the said sworn statements, they deposed that the subject lands stood in the name of their father as pattadar had fallen to the share of father of the petitioner and the father of petitioner and husband of respondent No.6 were in actual, physical possession and enjoyment of the same. Basing on the said sworn statements of brothers of respondent No.5, *vide* order dated 15.12.2010 in proceedings No.B/6992/2010, the Tahsildar while entering the names of other two brothers of respondent No.5 in pattadar column, the names of petitioner and respondent Nos.6, 7 and 8 were entered in cultivator/possessor column.

30. According to respondent No.5, while so, when the petitioner herein and respondent Nos.6 to 8 are trying to interfere with

his peaceful possession and enjoyment, he filed a suit in O.S. No.135 of 2010 on the file of Junior Civil Judge, Vikarabad, seeking perpetual injunction and obtained *interim* orders in I.A. No.323 of 2010. Thereafter, the said *interim* order dated 16.07.2010 was modified to that of *status quo* vide order dated 25.10.2010 in I.A. No.323 of 2010. Assailing the said order dated 25.10.2010 in I.A. No.323 of 2010, respondent No.5 herein preferred an appeal *vide* CMA No.30 of 2012. *Vide* order dated 12.03.2013, learned Additional District Judge, Vikarabad, dismissed the said appeal. Challenging the said order, respondent No.5 herein filed a revision *vide* C.R.P. No.1828 of 2013 before this Court. *Vide* order dated 13.06.2013, this Court also dismissed the said revision.

31. While so, when the petitioner and his brothers are also trying to mutate their names in revenue records, the revenue officials revised the proceedings dated 04.02.2019 in file No.F/269/2016 and pursuant to the same, the Tahsildar was proceeding to mutate the names of petitioner and his brothers. Thereafter, respondent No.5 filed a writ petition in W.P. No.6107 of 2019 to declare the action of respondent Nos.2 to 4 herein in incorporating the names of the

petitioner and respondent Nos.6 to 8 in the pahanies in respect of subject lands pursuant to the revised proceedings in file No.F/269/2016 dated 04.02.2019 even without waiting for outcome of the judgment in O.S. No.135 of 2010 based on the adverse report dated 26.02.2019 furnished by respondent No.2 as illegal. However, the Revenue Officials issued latest pattadar passbooks-cum-title deeds in favour of the petitioner and respondent Nos.6 to 8.

32. During pendency of the said writ petition, respondent No.5 came to know that the petitioner herein and his brothers approached the Lokayukta and obtained an order dated 20.06.2015 in Complaint No.2557/2011/B1 for issuance of pattadar passbooks and title deeds in respect of the subject lands without making him as a party. Challenging the said order passed by Lokayukta, respondent No.5 also filed a writ petition in W.P. No.28211 of 2019 before this Court. *Vide* common order dated 01.02.2022, a Division Bench of this Court allowed both the writ petitions, setting aside the impugned order dated 20.06.2015 passed by Lokayukta. It was observed by the Division Bench that W.P. No.6107 of 2019 was filed challenging the subsequent action of authorities pursuant to the order dated

20.06.2015 passed by the Lokayukta and that since the said order of the Lokayukta is set aside, all subsequent orders/actions pursuant to the said order of Lokayukta are also set aside.

33. Thereafter, respondent No.5 made online application dated 22.12.2022 with a request to respondent No.2 herein, to correct the wrong entries by deleting the entries in respect of the petitioner and respondent Nos.6 to 8. As respondent No.2 did not take any action, he filed another writ petition in W.P. No.19757 of 2022 against the official respondents to declare their action in not restoring the entries in revenue records in respect of the subject lands in terms of the common order dated 01.02.2022 in W.P. Nos.28211 and 6107 of 2019 as illegal. *Vide* order dated 03.04.2023, this Court disposed of the said writ petition directing respondent No.2 herein to consider the same in accordance with law. Pursuant to the same, respondent No.2 herein passed an order dated 13.12.2023, disallowing the aforesaid online application dated 22.12.2022, wherein respondent No.2 observed that the issue is family dispute about partition of lands among family members. Therefore, he has no jurisdiction on civil disputes/family disputes and accordingly advised both the parties to approach

competent Court for the redressal of their dispute. In view of the same, the contempt case filed by respondent No.5 in C.C. No.153 of 2024 was closed on 01.03.2024. However, C.C. No.485 of 2024 filed by respondent No.5 against the order dated 01.02.2022 in W.P. No.485 of 2024 was also closed.

34. Challenging the said order dated 13.12.2023, respondent filed one more writ petition in W.P. No.2155 of 2024, wherein *vide* order dated 30.01.2024, this Court ordered to maintain *status quo* as on that day with regard to the revenue entries in respect of the subject lands and the same was extended on 20.02.2024. While so, respondent No.5 also made online application dated 14.06.2024 for missing survey number/sub-division. *Vide* order dated 08.07.2024 in file No.E2/724/2024, respondent No.2 passed the order restoring the name of respondent No.5 recorded in revenue entries prior to the impugned order passed by Lokayukta and accordingly considered the said online application. However, it was observed that missing survey number addition does not mean granting mutation in favour of anyone as per his office orders dated 13.12.2023 the entry was kept in inactive mode until further orders from the competent Court. While *status quo*

order was in force, the official respondents entered the name of respondent No.5 by removing the names of family members of the petitioner. Thereafter, respondent No.5 withdrew W.P. No.2155 of 2024 on 21.08.2024. However, as there was no clarity on what basis the revenue entries have been changed and pattadar passbook was issued in favour of respondent No.5, a review application *vide* I.A. No.1 of 2022 in W.P. No.6107 of 2019 was filed and the same is pending. Similarly, respondent Nos.6 and 8 filed a contempt case in C.C. No.1379 of 2024 in W.P. No.2155 of 2024 against the official respondents and respondent No.5 herein contending that they not only willfully violated the orders dated 30.01.2024 passed by this Court in W.P. No.2155 of 2024 but also suppressed the pendency of review petition in I.A. No.1 of 2022 in W.P. No.6107 of 2019 dated 15.03.2022 before the Division Bench of this Court. *Vide* order dated 25.08.2025, this Court declined to entertain the contempt case and accordingly closed the same. However, liberty was granted to the parties to pursue review petition in W.P. No.6107 of 2019 and also in W.P. No.2155 of 2024. Challenging the said order, respondent Nos.6 and 8 filed Letter Patent Appeal No.15 of 2025 before the Division

Bench. *Vide* order dated 12.02.2026, the Division Bench of this Court dismissed the said LPA.

35. In view of the aforesaid discussion, it is clear that the disputes between the parties, essentially concerns the title and the alleged partition in respect of the subject lands. One set of family members asserts that the subject lands fell to their share pursuant to a partition said to have taken place long ago among their ancestors, whereas the other set of family members disputes the same. It is also apparent that, on account of the continuing dispute between the parties, successive writ petitions have been filed before this Court. The competent Revenue Authority, upon consideration of the rival claims, has rightly observed that the disputed rights and title of the parties cannot be conclusively determined in revenue proceedings and that the parties ought to approach the competent Civil Court for adjudication of their respective claims. In the circumstances, the disputed questions relating to title, partition, possession and entitlement to the subject lands involve questions of fact and law which require appreciation of evidence and cannot appropriately be adjudicated in proceedings under Article - 226 of the Constitution of

India. The writ jurisdiction of this Court cannot be invoked for determining disputed questions of title between rival private parties, particularly when an efficacious remedy before the competent Civil Court is available.

36. As far as contempt case is concerned, it is the case of the petitioner that he filed the above writ petition to declare the action of official respondents in deleting the subject lands without issuing prior notice to the registered holders in the Record of Rights by contravening principles of natural justice. *Vide* order dated 09.07.2024, this Court passed the following order:

“Therefore the petitioner and respondent Nos.2, 4, 5 to 8 are directed to maintain *status quo*, with regard to the entries in the revenue records in respect of the land admeasuring Acs.14.27 gts., in Sy.No.110 and 131 situated at Rompally Village, Bantwaram Mandal, Vikarabad District, till 20.08.2024.”

Despite the aforesaid order passed by this Court, the official respondents entered the name of respondent No.5 in writ petition in respect of Survey No.131 only on 11.07.2024. Even as on 10.07.2024 night 11.45 P.M., the status of entries in Dharani Portal had shown

both the Survey numbers as unsigned/deleted only. But, only on 11.07.2024, the name of respondent No.5 was seen, that too in respect of Survey No.131 only, leaving Survey No.110. Thus, the respondents in the contempt case willfully and deliberately disobeyed the aforesaid *status quo* orders passed by this Court and, therefore, they are liable to be punished.

37. Whereas, it is contended by the respondents that they came to know about the aforesaid *status quo* order passed by this Court only after approval of online application of respondent No.5 by respondent No.2 in the writ petition *vide* proceedings dated 08.07.2024. Further, the petitioner himself admitted that the revenue entries were already restored by 09.07.2024. Thus, there is no violation of *interim* orders passed by this Court as this Court passed the *interim* orders on 09.07.2024, dispatched the same on 12.07.2024, whereas the revenue entries were restored on 08.07.2024.

38. However, having regard to the subsequent developments and the nature of the disputes between the parties, this Court is of the view that it would not be appropriate to continue the contempt proceedings. The disputes between the parties are in respect of title,

taking place of partition and their entitlement over the subject lands. One set of parties' claims that the properties had fallen to their share pursuant to an ancestral partition said to have taken place long ago, while the other party dispute the same. The Revenue Authorities themselves have taken the view that the rival claims with regard to title and partition cannot be adjudicated in revenue proceedings and that the parties have to approach the competent Civil Court. In such circumstances, continuance of present contempt proceedings would, in effect, requires this Court to examine and determine the very rights which are yet to be adjudicated by the competent Civil Court. Such an exercise would be beyond the legitimate scope of contempt jurisdiction.

39. It is also well settled that, before a person can be held guilty of civil contempt, the disobedience of the order of the Court must be established to be deliberate and wilful. Contempt jurisdiction is essentially concerned with ensuring compliance with the orders of the Court and is not intended to adjudicate complicated questions of title or to resolve substantive disputes between the parties. Where the circumstances disclose a *bona fide* dispute as to the scope, effect or

applicability of the order, and the underlying rights of the parties themselves remain to be adjudicated by the competent Civil Court, it would not be appropriate to continue the proceedings merely on the basis of an allegation of disobedience.

40. In the present case, the subsequent order directing the parties to work out their respective rights before the competent Civil Court substantially alters the context in which the alleged violation is required to be examined. The parties are required to establish their respective claims before the competent Civil Court and the Revenue Authorities are bound to act in accordance with the order or decree that may ultimately be passed by the competent Civil Court. In view of the above circumstances, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the rival claims or on the title to the subject lands, this Court is of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the contempt proceedings pending. **The contempt case is accordingly dismissed.** However, it is made clear that the closure of the contempt case shall not be construed as an adjudication or acceptance of the rights or claims of either party in respect of the

subject properties. All such questions are left open to be decided by the competent Civil Court.

41. In the light of the aforesaid discussion, the writ petition is accordingly dismissed. However, the parties are at liberty to agitate their respective claims and rights in respect of the subject lands before the competent Civil Court, which shall adjudicate in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any of the observations made herein. The Revenue Authorities shall thereafter abide by and give effect to the decree or order passed by the competent Civil Court, in accordance with law. In view of the above, no adjudication of the disputed title or partition rights is warranted in the present writ petition, and the parties are relegated to the remedy of approaching the competent Civil Court for appropriate relief. In the circumstances of the case, there shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in the Writ Petition and the Contempt Case shall stand closed.

3rd September, 2026
Mgr

K. LAKSHMAN, J