

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE No: W.A. Nos. 441, 442, 659 and 661 of 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
03.	12.08.2026	<u>HCJ (AKrS, J) & GMM, J</u> Mr. V. Siddhartha Goud, learned counsel appears for Mr. V. Narasimha Goud, learned Standing Counsel for Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority (HMDA), for appellant in W.A.Nos.441 and 442 of 2026 and for respondent Nos.13 and 4 in W.A.Nos.659 and 661 of 2026 respectively. Mr. A. Venkatesh, learned Senior Counsel represents Ms. Shraddha Gupta, learned counsel for the appellants in W.A.Nos.659 and 661 of 2026. Mr. T. Sharath, learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 to 11/writ petitioners in W.A.Nos.441 and 659 of 2026 and for respondent Nos.1 and 2/writ petitioners in W.A.Nos.442 and 661 of 2026. Mr. K. Ravi Mahender, learned Standing Counsel for Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation appears for respondent No.12 in W.A.Nos.441 and 659 of 2026 and for respondent No.3 in W.A.Nos.442 and 661 of 2026. Against the common order under appeal dated 09.06.2025 passed by the learned writ Court, in Writ Petition Nos.3698 and 16595 of 2023, W.A.Nos.441 and 442 of 2026 have been preferred by HMDA and W.A.Nos.659 and 661 of 2026 by the developers.	Transferred to i/o folder before corrections, if any.

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		Petitioner No.1 association along with another filed W.P.No.3698 of 2023 and members of such association filed W.P.No.16595 of 2023 assailing the revised layout plan dated 26.04.2013 and consequential building permit dated 20.01.2015 and also revised building permit dated 03.11.2017 alleging lack of notice and impermissibility of such revision. The latest counter affidavit filed by the association, in W.A.No.442 of 2026, however, indicates a climb down from their original position. Learned senior counsel for the appellant developers and the writ petitioners have relied upon the said counter affidavit to submit that by the revised layout, an area of 1718 Sq.yards, which also forms part of the park/amenities under the original layout, has been taken away by adjusting the same area at three places of the layout plan for granting egress and ingress to the residents of the villa community constructed on Survey No.32. The owner and the developers have sought layout plan approval on Survey No.31 for developing a villa community complex and on Survey No.32 for developing a multistoried residential complex. By the revised layout plan taking away an area of 1718 Sq.yards of the park earmarked under the original layout of Survey No.31, the same has in effect gone to the adjacent Survey No.32. Learned senior counsel for the appellant developers has pointed out that the area of 1718 Sq.yards always forms part of Survey No.32 i.e.,	

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		multistoried residential complex. The revised layout plan produced on behalf of the appellant developers however leaves room for doubt on the ground situation as to whether 1718 Sq.yards of land under the revised layout plan still forms part of Survey No.32 or Survey No.31. GHMC allowed the building permission and HMDA has granted original and revised layouts. What is the mechanism in HMDA to verify and sanction the proposal of layout plan submitted by the applicant? Whether it falls under a particular Survey Number or beyond it needs to be clarified by HMDA in order to come to a conclusion as to whether the revised layout plan actually affects the adjacent Survey No.32 which HMDA could not have encroached upon while revising the original layout of 2004. Learned counsel for HMDA seeks time to obtain instructions and come out with the clarification and if necessary, the relevant survey map and the original and revised layouts approved by them. The competent officer of HMDA should also be present on the next date to explain the same. Let the matters appear on 01.09.2026. In the meanwhile, interim stay on the costs granted earlier continues. HCJ(AKrS, J) GMM, J <i>kvni</i>	