



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

TUESDAY, THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUDDALA CHALAPATHI RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 46114 OF 2016

Between:

1. Mr. Gorla Maheedhar Reddy, S/o. G. Babu Reddy R/o Prajay Crest, S.P. Road, Secunderabad, Temporarily Residing at 3621, Nahcliva Drive, Flower Mound, Texas T5022, U.S.A.
2. Mrs. Beeravolu Ramani Reddy, W/o. Gorla Maheedhar Reddy R/o Prajay Crest, S.P. Road, Secunderabad. Temporarily Residing at 3621, Nanchliva Drive, Flower Mound, Texas T5022, U.S.A.
Petitioner 1 and 2 are represented by their SPA holder Mr. Beeravolu Surender Reddy arrayed as P-3
3. Mr. Beeravolu Surender Reddy, S/o Late. B. Ramana Reddy Aged 70 years, Occ Retd. Govt. Employee, R/o Prajay Crest, S.P. Road, Secunderabad.

...PETITIONERS

AND

1. The Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation, Buddha Purnima Bhavan, Tank Bund Road, Hyderabad. Rep. by its Commissioner
2. Baby Gummakonda Sruthima Reddy, S/o. Gummakonda Yadava Reddy Aged about 16 years, Occ Student. R/o H.No. 3-1-35/1, Hyderguda village, Rajendemagar, R.R. Dist., Hyderabad
3. Baby Gummakonda Sinduja Reddy, D/o. Gummakonda Yadava Reddy Aged about 13 years, Occ Student R/o H.No. 3-1-35/1, Hyderguda village, Rajendemagar, R.R. Dist., Hyderabad

The Respondent Nos. 2 & 3 are minors and are represented by their natural Guardian Smt. G.Soujanya Reddy, W/o. Sri. G. Yadava Reddy arrayed as R-4

4. G.Soujanya Reddy, W/o. Sri. G. Yadava Reddy Aged about 40 years, R/o H.No. 3-1-35/1, Hyderguda village, Rajendemagar, R.R. Dist., 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 a Writ of Mandamus or any other Writ against the inaction of the authorities of Respondent No.1 in taking necessary action against the illegal construction made by Respondent No.2 and 3 in Plot No. 49, Sy.366, in category



2026:TSHC:5274

HIG of Attapur Residential Complex at Attapur, Rajendra Nagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District as arbitrary, illegal, biased and unconstitutional and also consequently direct the authorities of Respondent No.1 to demolish the illegal construction made by Respondent No. 2 to 4, in Plot No. 49, Sy. No. 366, in category HIG of Attapur Residential Complex at Attapur, Rajendra Nagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy district.

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2016(WPMP. NO: 56787 OF 2016)

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 to stop the construction on Plot No.49, Sy.366, in category HIG of Attapur Residential Complex at Attapur, Rajendra Nagar Mandal, pending the Writ Petition.

I.A. NO: 2 OF 2016(WPMP. NO: 56788 OF 2016)

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 officials of Respondent No. 1 to inspect the site and to file the report of the construction before this Hon'ble court along with the building permission and other records if any, which are related to the said construction being made by Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 in Plot No.49, Sy. No. 366, in category HIG of Attapur Residential Complex at Attapur, Rajendra Nagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy, pending the above Writ Petition.

**Counsel for the Petitioner(s): SRI K. ASWATH JANARDHAN REP. FOR
SRI KOPAL SHARRAF**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.1: SRI RAPARTHI VENKATESH
(SC FOR GHMC)**

Counsel for the Respondent No.2 to 4: SRI SREENIVASA RAO VELIVELA

The Court made the following: ORDER



2026:TSHC:5274

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

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUDDALA CHALAPATHI RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.46114 OF 2016

DATE: 17.02.2026

Between:

Mr. Gorla Maheedhar Reddy s/o. G.Babu Reddy,
r/o. Prajay Crest, SP Road, Secunderabad and two others.

.... Petitioners

and

The Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation,
Rep.by its Commissioner, Tank Bund Road,
Hyderabad, and three others.

.... Respondents

ORDER:

Heard Mr. K.Aswath Janardhan learned counsel representing
Mr. Kopal Sharaff, learned counsel for petitioners and Mr. Balu
Dudekula, learned counsel representing Mr. Raparathi Venkatesh,
learned Standing Counsel for respondent No.1.

2. The instant writ petition has been filed declaring the inaction
of the respondent No.1 in taking necessary action against the illegal
construction made by the respondent Nos.2 to 4 in Plot No.49,
Sy.No.366, in Category HIG of Attapur Residential Complex at
Attapur, Rajendra Nagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, as
arbitrary, illegal, biased and unconstitutional and consequently



direct the authorities of respondent No.1 to demolish the illegal constructions made by the respondent Nos.2 to 4 over the said plot.

3. When the matter is taken up for hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners asserts that there are deviations in the construction made by the unofficial respondent No.2 to 4 over the subject plot and despite the petitioner filing a complaint, the respondent No.1 is not contemplating any action.

4. Learned counsel representing learned Standing Counsel for GHMC would contend that as per the counter-affidavit, the authorities of the respondent No.1 have inspected the subject site and found certain deviations from the sanctioned plan in the constructions carried out by the respondent Nos.2 to 4 and consequently, notices were issued to them. However, learned Standing Counsel has placed on record a building permit order dated 16.02.2023, showing that the approved plan permits construction of one stilt plus four upper floors.

5. In that view of the matter, learned Standing Counsel would submit that, cause in the writ petition does not survive and the same is liable to be dismissed. However, learned counsel for petitioner



contends that though the building permission was granted to the unofficial respondents in the year 2023, still there are some deviations in the construction over the subject property.

6. In that view of the matter, now the permission is accorded to the unofficial respondents, the earlier complaint is misconceived and the writ petitioner is at liberty to file a representation before the respondent No.1 along with all relevant particulars showing how the sanctioned plan was deviated by the unofficial respondents. If any representation is made by the petitioners, the respondent No.1 is directed to inspect the site and conduct an enquiry by following due procedure of law as envisaged under the provisions of GHMC Act, 1995, by giving opportunity to both the parties and pass appropriate orders thereon and take action pursuant thereof.

7. With the above direction, the Writ Petition is disposed of.

There shall be no order as to costs.

Pending miscellaneous applications if any shall stand closed.

SD/-C. DEEPIKA
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Commissioner, The Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation, Buddha Purnima Bhavan, Tank Bund Road, Hyderabad.
2. One CC to SRI KOPAL SHARRAF, Advocate [OPUC]
3. One CC to SRI SREENIVASA RAO VELIVELA, Advocate [OPUC]
4. One CC to SRI RAPARTHI VENKATESH (SC FOR GHMC TELANGANA) [OPUC]
5. Two CD Copies



2026:TSHC:5274

HIGH COURT

DATED:17/02/2026

ORDER

WP.No.46114 of 2016



**DISPOSING OF THE WRIT PETITION
WITHOUT COSTS**

ENT
17/3/26