



2026:TSHC:11123
[3301]

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

**FRIDAY, THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE PULLA KARTHIK

WRIT PETITION NO: 17203 OF 2025

Between:

1. Sri Uday Kumar Mor, Prop. M/s Parvathi Estate, S/o. Bharath Kumar Mor, Aged. 59 Years, Occ. Business, R/o. Plot No. 1304, Road No. 12, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad.
2. Sri Ajay Kumar Modi, S/o. Sri Dina Nath Modi, Aged 60 years, Occupation. Business, R/o 5-9-22/60, Adarsh Nagar, Hyderabad.
3. Smt. Roshini Gupta, W/o. Govind Kumar Gupta, Aged 56 years, Household, R/o. Flat No.8S, 8th Floor, One Hyd Park, H.No.8-2-293/80/1, Road No-14, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad, Telangana State.

...PETITIONERS

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by Principal Secretary, (Revenue Department), Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. District Collector, Rangareddy District.
3. Joint Collector (Revenue), Rangareddy District.
4. Revenue Divisional Officer, Rangareddy District.
5. Tahsildar, Ganidpet Mandal, Rangareddy District.
6. The Chief Commissioner of Land Administration (CCLA), Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad
7. Commissioner and Inspector General (Stamps and Registration), Nizam Shahi Road, M.J. Market, Hyderabad.

...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 an order, direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus



declaring the action of the official respondent authorities in including the Petitioners properties totally admeasuring Ac.5.18 Guntas which includes Ac.3.25 Gts of Petitioner No.1, Ac.0.33 Guntas of Petitioner No.2, Ac.0.33 Guntas of Petitioner No.3, 855 Sq.Yds (Ac.0.07Gts) of both Petitioner No.2 and 3, forming part of Sy. No. 166 of Kokapet Village, erstwhile Hyderabad West Taluk and Hyderabad District, Rajendranagar Mandal, presently under Gandipet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District in the Prohibited List of Properties by recourse to Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908 or under any GO or Circular/Memo etc. on the ground that the property covered by Survey No. 166 as Poramboke/Sarkari as illegal, arbitrary, colourable exercise of power, unjust and contrary to the law and violative of Articles 14, 21, and 300-A of the Constitution of India, and consequently direct the Respondent Authorities to delete the above landed properties from Prohibited List of Properties/Prohibitory Order Book/Digital Records of the revenue registers and further award damages and compensation for the arbitrary and illegal exercise of the power under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908 or under any GO or Circular by the Respondent Authorities by directing for payment of compensation for violation of the Petitioners rights in dealing with the aforesaid properties.

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2025

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 to direct the Respondent Authorities herein to delist the Petitioners properties viz. admeasuring Ac. 3.25 Guntas of Petitioner No.1, Ac.0.33 Guntas of Petitioner No.2, Ac. 0.33 Guntas of Petitioner No.3, 855 Sq.Yds of both Petitioner No.2 and 3, out of the total land of Ac.10.36 Gts forming part of Sy. No. 166/1(166/1A) of Kokapet Village, erstwhile Hyderabad West Taluk and Hyderabad District, Rajendranagar Mandal, presently under Gandipet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District from the Prohibited List of Properties under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908 or under any GO or Circular Memo.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2025

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 to permit the petitioners to deal with their properties including sale of the properties admeasuring



2026:TSHC:11123

Ac.3.25 Guntas of Petitioner No.1, Ac.0.33 Guntas of Petitioner No.2, Ac. 0.33 Guntas of Petitioner No.3, 855 Sq.Yds (Ac.0.07Gts) of both Petitioner No.2 and 3, out of the total land of Ac.10.36 Gts forming part of Sy. No. 166/1(166/1A) of Kokapet Village, erstwhile Hyderabad West Taluk and Hyderabad District, Rajendranagar Mandal, presently under Gandipet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District from the Prohibited List of Properties under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908 or under any GO or Circular Memo.

**Counsel for the Petitioners: MR. RAJA SRIPATHI RAO, REPRESENTING
M/S LEX ARJAVA LLP**

Counsel for the Respondents: MS. SRAVANTHI, AGP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following: ORDER



2026:TSHC:11123

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE PULLA KARTHIK**

WRIT PETITION No.17203 OF 2025

Dated 17th APRIL, 2026

BETWEEN :

Sri Uday Kumar Mor & others ... Petitioners

v.

State of Telangana,
Rep. By Principal Secretary
(Revenue Department),
Secretariat, Hyderabad & others ... Respondents

ORDER:

Aggrieved by the action of the respondents in including the properties of the petitioners forming part of survey No.166 of Kokapet Village, erstwhile Hyderabad West Taluk and Hyderabad District, Rajendranagar Mandal, presently Gandipet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, in the list of prohibited properties by recourse to Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908, and consequently to direct the respondent authorities to delete the subject properties from prohibited list of properties/prohibitory order book/digital records of the revenue registers and further to award damages and compensation for arbitrary and illegal exercise of power under



Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908, the present writ petition is filed.

2) The case of the petitioners, in brief, is that originally one Mr.Abdul Gafoor S/o.Mohd. Hyder Ali was the absolute owner and possessor of several extents of land including the land in survey No.166 admeasuring Acs.41-32 guntas of Kokapet Village, erstwhile Hyderabad West Taluk and Hyderabad District, Rajendranagar Mandal, presently Gandipet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, and his name is figured as pattedar and possessor in pahani patrika of the year 1953-54 including Khasra Pahani of the year 1954-55 as well as in subsequent pahani patrikas. He submitted an application under Sections 47 and 48 of Hyderabad Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1950, to the then Tahsildar, Hyderabad West, seeking permission to sell the land in favour of one Mrs.Mukundalal Rathi. Vide proceedings No.D.Dis/A3/10032/1964 dated 20.07.1964, permission was granted to Abdul Gaffoor and accordingly, he sold the land to an extent of Acs.22-17 guntas under registered sale deed No.387/1964 dated 10.08.1964. After the purchase, said Mukundalal Rathi got mutated her name in the revenue records. Thereafter, she sold the said land to Sri



Inder Mohan Kapur under a registered sale deed No.221 of 1966 dated 15.03.1966 after obtaining permission from the then Tahsildar under Sections 47 and 48 of Hyderabad Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1950, vide proceedings in D.Dis.B3/5018/1965 and the name of Inder Mohan Kapur was also shown in the revenue records as pattedar.

2.1) Thereafter, said Inder Mohan Kapur has improved the land by digging borewells, constructed water tanks and got the land fenced by spending huge amounts and also developed the land in survey No.166/1/A by constructing poultry farm and carried poultry business in the said premises. After enactment of Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agriculture Holdings) Act, 1973 (in short 'Land Ceiling Act'), said Inder Mohan Kapur submitted declarations to Government showing the lands in Puppalguda Village and Kokapet Villages. After following due process under the Land Ceiling Act, the Land Reforms Tribunal, Hyderabad West, passed an order in C.C. No.1236/W/75 dated 07.02.1978 observing that Inder Mohan Kapur was in excess of standard holding of 0-2905 and was called upon to surrender the excess land held by him. Accordingly, Inder Mohan Kapur had



surrendered the land admeasuring Acs.18-82 cents out of the land in survey No.290 and 292 (part) of Puppalguda Village, Rajender Nagar Mandal, and retained the other lands including the land in survey No.166/1/A of Kokapet Village. Subsequently, petitioner No.1 and one Ashok Kumar Gupta, being the partners of M/s.Parvathi Estates, have purchased the land admeasuring Acs.10-36 guntas in survey No.166/1 (166/1/A) from Inder Mohan Kapur through registered sale deed No.2116/1982 dated 20.03.1982 and the name of M/s.Parvati Estates was mutated in the revenue records and pattadar passbooks were also issued by the Tahsildar after conducting due enquiry and by following due procedure contemplated under the A.P. Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971.

2.2) Further, after dissolution of the partnership Firm i.e. M/s.Parvathi Estates, petitioner No.1 and the other partner Ashok Kumar Gupta got Acs.5-18 guntas of land each towards their share. Out of the land fell to the share of petitioner No.1, he sold an extent of Ac.0.33 guntas to petitioner No.2 through registered sale deed No.1397/1996 dated 15.05.1996 and Ac.0.33 guntas to petitioner No.3 through registered sale deed No.1398/1996 dated



15.05.1996 and an extent of 855 sq. yards jointly in favour of petitioner Nos.2 and 3 through registered sale deed No.1396/1996 dated 15.05.1996. While so, the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District, issued a notice dated 29.01.2001, proposing to cancel the pattadar passbooks and title deeds issued in favour of petitioners 1 and 2 on the basis of the report of the Tahsildar that the land in survey No.166 admeasuring Acs.41-32 guntas is poramboke land. To the said notice, petitioners 1 and 2 have submitted a detailed explanation denying the claim of the Government that it is a government land. After hearing the parties, the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy, vide order dated 30.08.2003 in case No.D/20/2001 held that the name of Abdul Gaffoor was recorded as pattadar in pahani for the year 1954-55 without orders from any competent authority and thereby expunged the entries in the revenue records from the pattadar column. Challenging the same, petitioner No.1 and his predecessors-in-interest and other co-owners have filed W.P.No.26006 of 2003 & batch wherein vide common order dated 15.11.2016 this Court has set aside the order dated 30.08.2003 passed by the Joint Collector holding that the Joint Collector cannot initiate proceedings after long lapse of 48 years to unsettle



the settled things which became final. The appeals preferred by the Government vide Writ Appeal Nos.1546 of 2017 & batch were dismissed by the Division Bench vide common judgment dated 10.11.2017. Thereafter, the authorities have instituted a Civil Suit in O.S. No.310 of 2020 on the file of XII Additional District and Sessions Judge, Ranga Reddy District, at L.B. Nagar, against petitioner No.1 and others seeking declaration that the State is the owner of the land admeasuring Acs.41.32 guntas of survey No.166 of Kokapet Village, Gandipet Mandal. In the said suit, petitioner No.1 filed I.A. No.34 of 2024 seeking rejection of plaint under Order VII Rule 11 (a) and (d) of the Code of Civil Procedure. After analyzing the entire factual aspects, the trial Court, vide order dated 20.02.2025, has allowed I.A. No.34/2024 and rejected the plaint and ignoring all the above factual aspects, the respondents have included the subject properties in the list of prohibited properties list maintained under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908. Hence, the petitioners are before this Court.

3) Heard Mr. Raja Sripathi Rao, learned senior counsel, representing M/s. Lex Arjava LLP, for the petitioner, and



Ms.Sravanthi, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue as well as Stamps and Registration appearing for the respondents.

4) Learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the Division Bench of this Court in its common order dated 10.11.2017 in Writ Appeal Nos.1546 of 2017 & batch has categorically held that even by the date of disposal of the writ appeals no fraud was detected and the revisional jurisdiction is required to be exercised within a reasonable period of discovery of fraud. Further, before the Civil Court in O.S. No.310 of 2020 the respondent authorities have pleaded that as per the Settlement Records of Kokapet Village i.e. Sethwar 1355 Fasli and Pahanis for the year 1950, 1951 and 1952 the land in survey No.166 of Kokapet Village admeasuring Acs.41-32 guntas is Poramboke/Sarkari land and that in the year 2000 while considering the petition filed by one Smt. Lakshmi Devi Agarwal through her son Arvind Kumar Agarwal for grant of succession of a portion of land forming part of survey No.166, the Mandal Revenue Officer, Rajendra Nagar, had noticed some individual names in the pahanis without any valid orders, proceedings, documents and therefore submitted a report dated 21.12.2000 to the Collector,



Ranga Reddy District, to protect the government land in survey No.166 of Kokapet Village and that the claims are based on fraudulent entries in Khasra Pahani. Further, in O.S. No.310 of 2020, it was specifically pleaded that the name of Abdul Gaffoor Saab is fraudulently entered in pattadar column of Khasra Pahani for the year 1954-55 without any valid orders of the competent authority and therefore the same are void. Learned senior counsel contends that in O.S. No.310 of 2020, the respondent authorities have suppressed the proceedings under Sections 47 and 48 of the Hyderabad Tenancy Act obtained by the predecessor-in-title of the petitioners, declaration made under Land Ceiling Act given by the Inder Mohan Kapur, who is the vendor of petitioner No.1, and accepted by the revenue authorities and simply invoked the jurisdiction of the Civil Court seeking declaratory relief without specifically pleading as to how and the manner in which the revenue records were made accessible to Abdul Gaffoor Saab. Further, the respondents never disputed the authenticity of the proceedings of the Tahsildar, who accorded permission envisaged under Sections 47 and 48 of Hyderabad Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act. Learned senior counsel vehemently contends that the



very filing of the civil suit itself is contrary to the orders of this Court in W.P. No.24716 of 2003 & batch dated 15.11.2016 confirmed by the Division Bench in W.A. Nos.1495 of 2017 & batch vide common judgment dated 10.11.2017. Learned senior counsel contends that in the common judgment dated 10.11.2017, the Hon'ble Division Bench observed that neither the order under appeal nor the order passed by the Division Bench would disable the authorities from initiating action in case material comes to light that the entire transaction is vitiated by fraud. However, without therebeing any new material or cause of action, the authorities have filed civil suit and the same is hit under *constructive res judicata* as this Court has already dealt with contemporaneous title of the petitioners in its common order dated 15.11.2016 passed in W.P. No.24716 of 2003 & batch. Further, the petitioners, being the owners of the properties having purchased the same for valuable sale consideration, have unimpeachable right, title and interest and respondents have no legal right to challenge the rights of the petitioners by unsubstantiated contentions, which are quite belated, as the revenue authorities have admittedly accorded permission for alienation in the year 1964. Therefore, exercising



the jurisdiction under Section 22-A of the Registration Act is highly arbitrary, illegal, unconstitutional and colourable exercise of power. Hence, the learned senior counsel prays this Court to allow the writ petition, as prayed for.

5) Per contra, the learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents submits that as per the revenue records, the land in survey No.166 admeasuring Acs.41.32 guntas situated at Kokapet Village, erstwhile Hyderabad West Taluk and Hyderabad District, Rajendranagar Mandal, presently Gandipet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, is government land classified as 'Poramboke/Sarkari' right from Sethwar for the year 1355 fasli (1945 AD) till the year 1954-55. But, in the Khasra pahani, the name of Abdul Gaffoor Saab was recorded illegally as pattadar of the land without any orders of competent authority and it is not known as to on what basis the said entry was recorded in the revenue records. Subsequently, the names of different persons were also recorded as pattadars in view of the sales made by pattadar/legal heirs. After noticing the illegal entries in the revenue records from the year 1954-55, the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District, has taken up the matter under Section 9 of A.P. Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Book Act, 1971,



and issued notices to all the concerned in file No.D/20/2001. After hearing the parties, the Joint Collector, passed the order dated 30.08.2003 declaring that the land is a government land as per the original sethwar of village and directed the then Mandal Revenue Officer, Rajendra Nagar Mandal, for restoration of entries in the revenue records from the year 1954-55 onwards by deleting the names of persons and recording that the land is a government land. Accordingly, the names of pattadars were rounded off and entries were made that it is a poramboke sarkari government land. As against the said order, W.P.Nos.24716 of 2003 & batch were filed and vide common order dated 15.11.2016 this Court has allowed the said writ petitions. Questioning the same, the Government filed appeals vide W.A. Nos.1495 of 2017 & batch. However, the said appeals were dismissed vide common judgment dated 10.11.2017. Thereafter, as per the opinion of the Advocate General vide Lr.No.29/2019 dated 14.08.2019, the Civil Suit was instituted vide O.S. No.310 of 2020 seeking declaration of title and recovery of possession in respect of the land admeasuring Acs.41-32 guntas in survey Nos.1661/1/A, 166/2, 166/3, 166/4 and 166/5. However, considering the I.A. No.34/2024 filed by



petitioner No.1 herein, the Civil Court has rejected the suit plaint on the ground that the suit is barred by limitation vide order dated 20.02.2025. Aggrieved by the said order, the Government has approached this Court vide ASSR Nos.13021, 13026, 13028, 13029 and 13031 of 2026 dated 23.03.2026 and the same are pending adjudication before this Court.

5.1) Learned Government Pleader submits that mere entries in revenue records do not confer any title unless the parties claiming to be the pattadars produce the documentary evidence as to on what basis the said land has been acquired by them and recorded as patta land from government land. In this case, the petitioners have failed to prove their right and title over the land before the Joint Collector in revision under Section 9 of Telangana State Record of Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971. Therefore, they are not entitled for any right and title as the Government is the owner of land as per original sethwar and subsequent revenue records up to the year 1954-55. Further, as per Bhubharati Portal, the land in survey No.166 of Kokapet Village is a government land and prohibited under Section 22-A of the Registration Act. The petitioners, without approaching the



competent authority for removal from the list of prohibited properties, has directly approached this Court and filed the present writ petition, which is not maintainable in the eye of law. As regards the contention of the petitioner with regard to the declaration proceedings of Sri Inder Mohan Kapur before the Land Reforms Tribunal and the permission accorded by the Tahsildar under Sections 47 and 48 of Tenancy Act, 1950, learned Government Pleader submits that the Tahsildar as well as the Land Reforms Tribunal might have passed the said orders due to fraudulent entries in the revenue records and the reflection of name of Abdul Gafoor in khasra pahani itself is illegal. Therefore, the said orders are not valid since the same were passed in respect of Government land. As the land is a government land, to avoid any further transactions in respect of the subject land, it is notified under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908. Therefore, there are no merits in the writ petition and prays to dismiss the same. Reliance has been placed on

- 1) ***S. Lingamaiah v. State of A.P.***¹;
- 2) ***Sankalchan Jayachand Bhai Patel v. Vithalbhai Jayachand Bhai Patel***²;

¹ 2004 (2) ALD 837

² 1996 (7) SC 658



3) ***Suraj Bhan v. Financial Commissioners***³ and

4) ***Jattu Ram v. Hakam Singh***⁴

6) This Court has taken note of the submissions made by respective counsel and perused the material on record.

7) A perusal of the record discloses that the name of Abdul Gaffoor Saab was recorded as pattadar and possessor in pahani of the year 1953-54 and Khasra Pahani for the year 1954-55. However, the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District, has issued a notice dated 29.01.2001 under Section 9 of A.P. Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971, based on the report of the Tahsildar, and proposing to cancel the pattadar passbooks and title deeds issued in favour of petitioner Nos.1 and 2, for which, petitioner No.1 had submitted a detailed explanation narrating the entire facts and denying the claim of the Government. However, the Joint Collector, in exercise of revisional jurisdiction under Section 9 of A.P. Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971, in case No.D/20/2001 passed orders dated 30.08.2003 holding that name of Mr.Abdul Gafoor was recorded as pattadar in the pahani for the year 1954-55 without any orders from

³ 2207/1 (103) RD 116

⁴ AIR 1994 1653



competent authority and declared that it is a government land. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner No.1 and others have filed Writ Petitions viz., W.P.Nos.24716, 23149 and 26006 of 2003 and 17499 of 2005 wherein vide common order dated 15.11.2016, this Court has set aside the order passed by the Joint Collector and allowed the writ petitions holding that the Joint Collector cannot initiate proceedings under Section 9 of A.P. Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971 after long lapse of 48 years and unsettle the settled things, which became final.

8) Further, questioning the common order dated 15.11.2016, the Government preferred appeals vide Writ Appeal Nos.1495, 1543, 1546 and 1606 of 2017. The Division Bench, vide common judgment dated 10.11.2017 dismissed all the Writ Appeals holding as under:

“.... In D.Narsinga Rao, the Supreme Court frowned upon delayed exercise of the revisional jurisdiction, and held that such delayed exercise of revisional jurisdiction would result in avoidable and endless uncertainty in human affairs, which is not the policy of law; even in cases where the order sought to be revised is fraudulent, the exercise of power must be within a reasonable period of discovery of the fraud; and simply describing an act or transaction to be fraudulent would not extend the time for its correction till infinity for, otherwise, exercise of



revisional power would itself tantamount to a fraud upon the statute that vests such power in an authority.

It is not even the case of appellants that any fraud has been detected as on date. Needless to state that since revisional jurisdiction, as held in D.Narsinga Rao is required to be exercised within a reasonable period of discovery of fraud, neither the order under appeal nor the order now passed by us would disable the appellants from initiating action in case material comes to light that the entire transaction is vitiated by fraud."

9) Subsequent to dismissal of writ appeals, the Government instituted a civil suit in O.S. No.310 of 2020 before the XII Additional District and Sessions Judge, Ranga Reddy District at L.B. Nagar, and the suit plaint was rejected vide order dated 20.02.2025 in I.A. No.34 of 2024 filed by petitioner No.1. Though the said order was challenged before this Court in ASSR Nos.13021, 13026, 13028, 13029 and 13031 of 2026 dated 23.03.2026, admittedly, no interim orders are passed thereon till date and as on date 20.02.2025 is in operation.

10) From the above factual position, it is clear that the claim of the respondents that subject land situated in survey No.166 of Kokapet Village is Government land has already been rejected by the learned Single Judge in W.P.Nos.26006 of 2003 & batch, vide common order dated 15.11.2016 and confirmed by the Division



Bench in W.A. Nos.1546 of 2017 & batch, vide common judgment dated 10.11.2017. Following the same, the Civil Court also rejected the plaint filed by the Government in O.S. No.310/2020 on the ground of limitation. Despite the same, the authorities ventured to include the subject lands in the list of prohibited properties under Section 22-A of the Registration Act merely on the ground that name of original pattadar Mr. Abdul Gaffoor was mentioned in Khasra Pahani without any orders from the competent authority without any basis.

11) In fact, in W.P. Nos.26006 of 2003 & batch, when the learned Government Pleader sought liberty to initiate proceedings, the learned Judge has refused the said request and relevant portion of the common order dated 15.11.2016 is as under:

“Though Government Pleader pleaded for giving liberty to initiate appropriate proceedings, but declaration filed under A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 by predecessors-in-interest of petitioners became final and if any such permission is given it amounts to allowing reopening the ceiling proceedings which have become final and sales were affected after obtaining permission. No fraud is pleaded by laying factual foundation to that effect.”

12) Even the Division Bench of this Court in its common Judgment dated 10.11.2017 made an observation that Government

can initiate action in case material comes to light that the entire transaction is vitiated by fraud.

13) But, even in the present writ petition also except making a bald statement that the name of Abdul Gafoor was illegally mentioned in Khasra Pahani for the year 1954-55, no material of any sought is putforth by the respondent authorities to substantiate their claim. Therefore, the action of the respondent authorities in including the subject lands in the list of prohibited properties is contrary to the orders of this Court, referred supra, illegal, arbitrary and without any basis, much less legal basis, and as such cannot be sustained.

14) For the afore-mentioned reasons, the Writ Petition is allowed directing the respondent authorities to delete the subject lands from the list of prohibited properties maintained under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, forthwith.

Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

No costs.

//TRUE COPY//

SD/- P.C. SULEKHA DEVI
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Secretary,(Revenue Department), Secretariat, The State of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. District Collector, Rangareddy District.



2026:TSHC:11123

3. Joint Collector (Revenue), Rangareddy District.
4. Revenue Divisional Officer, Rangareddy District.
5. Tahsildar, Ganidpet Mandal, Rangareddy District.
6. The Chief Commissioner of Land Administration (CCLA), Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad
7. Commissioner and Inspector General (Stamps and Registration), Nizam Shahi Road, M.J. Market, Hyderabad.
8. One CC to M/S Lex Arjava LLP, Advocate [OPUC]
9. Two CCs to GP for Revenue, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT]
10. Two CD Copies

TJ



2026:TSHC:11123

HIGH COURT

PK, J

DATED: 17/04/2026

ORDER

WP.No.17203 of 2025



**ALLOWING OF THE WRIT PETITION
WITHOUT COSTS**

(13)
MT
12/5/26