

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

MONDAY, THE FIRST DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B.VIJAYSEN REDDY

**WRIT PETITION Nos: 150 of 2013, 9240 of 2015, 20394 and 36489 of
2016 and 18652, 23169 and 30511 of 2018**

WRIT PETITION No: 150 of 2013

Between:

1. P.Narayana Rao, S/o. P.Narsoji Rao, Aged about 78 Years, Occ Retired Service,
2. Dr. N.Madhava Rao, S/o. Late N.Kishanji Rao, Aged about 62 years, Occ Retired Service,
3. Dr. Uma Maheshwari, W/o. Dr. N.Madhava Rao, Aged about 55 years, Occ Employee,

All are R/o. H.No.1-4-27/72/8, Padmashali Colony, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.

...PETITIONERS

AND

1. The Government of Andhra Pradesh, Through the Joint Collector, Hyderabad District, (On behalf of NOC Committee)
2. Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation, Rep. by Commissioner, Tank Bund Road, Hyderabad.
3. The Special Officer, Competent Authority, Urban Land Ceiling, Hyderabad.
4. M.Bikshapathi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 62 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
5. M.Ravi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 50 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
6. M.Anand, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 52 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
7. Venkatesh, S/o. Late Yellaiah, aged about 42 years, Occ: Building Worker, R/o. 1-4-1/8/c, Rangareddi pumpu Bavi, Basti, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
8. Shareefa bea, W/o. Haroon Rasheed, aged about 52 years, Occ: Employee Pvt., R/o. Bholakpur, Secunderabad.

Respondent Nos.4 to 8 are impleaded as per C.O. dt. 01.12.2025 in I.A.No.1/2018.

...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 appropriate writ, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring that the action of the respondent No. 1 in refusing the application for building permission in respect of Plot No. 7, 8 and 145 forming a part of Sy. No. 40, 41 and 42, admeasuring approximately 500 Sq. Yards covered by premises No.1-4027/72/7, 1-4-27/72/8 and 1-4-27/72/145, situated at Padmashali Colony, Kavadi Guda, Hyderabad, on the ground that the property is a Government land (INAM & A SURPLUS LAND) as being arbitrary, illegal and violative of Articles 14, 19 (1)(g), 21 and 300A of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondent No.2 to process the application of the petitioner for construction of the building in respect of Plot No. 7, 8 and 145 forming a part of Survey No. 40, 41, and 42 admeasuring approximately 500 Sq. Yards covered by premises No. 1-4-27/72/7, 1-4-27/72/8 and 1-4-27/72/145, situated at Padmashali Colony, Kavadi Guda, Hyderabad, without reference to proceeding of respondent No. 1 dated 22-03-2012 in File No. E1/1114/2012.

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2013(WPMP. NO: 200 OF 2013)

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 suspend the operation of the proceedings of respondent No. 1 dated 22-03-2012 in File No. E1/1114/2012 pending disposal of the above Writ Petition.

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2014(WVMP. NO: 3883 OF 2014)**Between:**

- 1 The Government of Andhra Pradesh, Through the Joint Collector, Hyderabad District, (On behalf of NOC Committee)
- 2 The Special Officer, Competent Authority, Urban Land Ceiling, Hyderabad.

...PETITIONERS**AND**

- 1 P.Narayana Rao, S/o. P.Narsoji Rao, Aged about 78 Years, Occ Retired Service,

- 2 Dr. N.Madhava Rao, S/o. Late N.Kishanji Rao, Aged about 62 years, Occ Retired Service,
 - 3 Dr. Uma Maheshwari, W/o. Dr. N.Madhava Rao, Aged about 55 years, Occ Employee,
- All are R/o. H.No.1-4-27/72/8, Padmashali Colony, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.
4. Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation, Rep. by Commissioner, Tank Bund Road, Hyderabad.

(R4 is not necessary party to this petition)

5. M.Bikshapathi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 62 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
6. M.Ravi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 50 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
7. M.Anand, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 52 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
8. Venkatesh, S/o. Late Yellaiah, aged about 42 years, Occ: Building Worker, R/o. 1-4-1/8/c, Rangareddi pumpu Bavi, Basti, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
9. Shareefa bea, W/o. Haroon Rasheed, aged about 52 years, Occ: Employee Pvt., R/o. Bholakpur, Secunderabad.

...RESPONDENTS

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 vacate the interim orders dt. 21-09-2013 passed in WPMP No.200/2013 in W.P.No.150/2013, pending disposal of the writ petition.

IA NO: 2 OF 2018

Between:

- 1 M.Bikshapathi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 62 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
- 2 M.Ravi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 50 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
- 3 M.Anand, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 52 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
- 4 Venkatesh, S/o. Late Yellaiah, aged about 42 years, Occ: Building Worker, R/o. 1-4-1/8/c, Rangareddi pumpu Bavi, Basti, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
- 5 Shareefa bea, W/o. Haroon Rasheed, aged about 52 years, Occ: Employee Pvt., R/o. Bholakpur, Secunderabad.

...PETITIONERS

AND

- 1 P.Narayana Rao, S/o. P.Narsoji Rao, Aged about 78 Years, Occ Retired Service,

2. Dr. N.Madhava Rao, S/o. Late N.Kishanji Rao, Aged about 62 years, Occ Retired Service,
3. Dr. Uma Maheshwari, W/o. Dr. N.Madhava Rao, Aged about 55 years, Occ Employee,
All are R/o. H.No.1-4-27/72/8, Padmashali Colony, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.
4. The Government of Andhra Pradesh, Through the Joint Collector, Hyderabad District, (On behalf of NOC Committee)
5. Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation, Rep. by Commissioner, Tank Bund Road, Hyderabad.
6. The Special Officer, Competent Authority, Urban Land Ceiling, Hyderabad.

...RESPONDENTS

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 Vacate the Interim Order granted in WP.MP. No. 200 of 2013 in WP.No.150 of 2013 dated 21.09.2013, pending disposal of the writ petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI VIJAY B.PAROPAKARI

**Counsel for the Respondent No.1 & 3: SRI CHALAPATHI RAO,
GP FOR ASSIGNMENT**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.2: SRI G.MADHUSUDHAN REDDY,
SC FOR GHMC**

Counsel for the Respondent No.4 to 8: SRI D.SRINIVAS

WRIT PETITION NO: 9240 OF 2015

Between:

1. Dr. N. Madhav Rao, S/o. Late N. Krishnaji Rao, Aged about 65 Years, Occ Doctor, R/o. H.No.12-4-27/72/28, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.
2. N.Vamshi Krishna, S/o. N. Madhav Rao, Aged about 27 Years, Occ Student, R/o. H.No.12-4-27/72/28, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.

...PETITIONERS

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by the Principal Secretary for Revenue, Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad - 500 022.
2. The District Collector, Hyderabad District, Nampally, Hyderabad-500 001.
3. The Tahsildar, Musheerabad Mandal, Hyderabad District, Hyderabad -500 020.
4. The Tahasildar, Secunderabad Mandal, Hyderabad District, Hyderabad - 500 007.

5. M.Bikshapathi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 62 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
6. M.Ravi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 50 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
7. M.Anand, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 52 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
8. Venkatesh, S/o. Late Yellaiah, aged about 42 years, Occ: Building Worker, R/o. 1-4-1/8/c, Rangareddi pumpu Bavi, Basti, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
9. Shareefa bea, W/o. Haroon Rasheed, aged about 52 years, Occ: Employee Pvt., R/o. Bholakpur, Secunderabad.

Respondent Nos.5 to 9 are impleaded as per C.O. dt. 01.12.2025 in I.A.No.1/2018.

...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 appropriate writ more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of respondents No.3 and 4 in the subject land and being treated as Government land and they have instructions to distribute the same to landless poor as being illegal, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14, 19 (i)(g), 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents not to take any steps to deal with plot Numbers 7 and 145 admeasuring 166.66 Sq. Yards and 180 Sq. Yards respectively situated at Padmashali Colony, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2015(WPMP. NO: 12172 OF 2015)

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 Stay all further proceedings including the dispossession of the petitioners from Plot Numbers 7 and 145 admeasuring 166.66 Sq. Yards and 180 Sq. Yards respectively situated at Padmashali Colony, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad, pending disposal of the above Writ Petition.

Counsel for the Petitioners: SRI VIJAY B.PAROPAKARI

**Counsel for the Respondent No.1 to 4: SRI CHALAPATHI RAO,
GP FOR ASSIGNMENT**

Counsel for the Respondent No.5 to 9: SRI D.SRINIVAS

WRIT PETITION NO: 20394 OF 2016

Between:

1. Dr. N. Madhav Rao, S/o late N. Krishnaji Rao, Aged about 66 years, Occ Doctor,
2. Dr. Vamshi Krishna, S/o N. Madhav Rao, Aged about 27 years, Occ Student,
Both are R/o H.No.1-4-27/72/28, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.

...PETITIONERS

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary, for Revenue, Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The District Collector, Hyderabad District, Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad.
3. The Special Officer and Competent authority, Urban land Ceiling, Nampally, Road, Hyderabad.
4. The Tahsildar/MRO, Secunderabad Mandal, Hyderabad District, Telangana State.
5. M.Bikshapathi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 62 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
6. M.Ravi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 50 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
7. M.Anand, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 52 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
8. Venkatesh, S/o. Late Yellaiah, aged about 42 years, Occ: Building Worker, R/o. 1-4-1/8/c, Rangareddi pumpu Bavi, Basti, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
9. Shareefa bea, W/o. Haroon Rasheed, aged about 52 years, Occ: Employee Pvt., R/o. Bholakpur, Secunderabad.

Respondent Nos.5 to 9 are impleaded as per C.O. dt. 01.12.2025 in I.A.No.1/2018.

...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, order or any other appropriate directions in the nature of Writ of Certiorari and after calling for the records connected to the impugned notices dated ____-06-2016 quash the same as being illegal, and inoperative.

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2016(WPMP. NO: 25015 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 suspend the operation of the impugned notices dated ___-06-2016, pending disposal of the above writ petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI VIJAY B.PAROPAKARI

**Counsel for the Respondent No.1 to 4: SRI CHALAPATHI RAO,
GP FOR ASSIGNMENT**

Counsel for the Respondent No.5 to 9: SRI D.SRINIVAS

WRIT PETITION NO: 36489 OF 2016**Between:**

1. Dr.N.Madhav Rao, S/o. Late N.Krishnaji Rao, Aged about 66 years, Occ Doctor,
2. Dr.Vamshi Krishna, S/o. Sri.N.Madhav Rao, Aged about 27 years, Occ Student,

Both are R/o.H.No.1-4-27/72/28, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad

...PETITIONERS

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary for Revenue, Secretariat, at Hyderabad
2. The District Collector, Hyderabad District, Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad
3. The Special Officer and Competent Authority, Urban Land Ceiling, Nampally Road, Hyderabad.
4. The Tahsildar/Mandal Revenue Officer, Secunderabad Mandal, Hyderabad District -TS

...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 appropriate writ or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents more particularly the action of the 4th Respondent in issuing the impugned proceedings dt.19-10-2016 as being arbitrary, illegal and violative of Articles 14,

19(1)(g), 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the 4th Respondent not to give effect to the impugned proceedings dt.19-10-2016

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2016(WPMP. NO: 44946 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 4th Respondent not to give effect to the impugned proceedings dt.19-10-2016 pending disposal of the main writ petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI VIJAY B.PAROPAKARI

Counsel for the Respondents: SRI CHALAPATHI RAO, GP FOR ASSIGNMENT

WRIT PETITION NO: 18652 OF 2018

Between:

1. Dr. N.Madhav Rao, S/o Late N. Krishnaji Rao, aged 66 years, Occ. Doctor,
 2. Dr. Vamshi Krishna, S/o Sri N. Madhav Rao, aged 27 years, Occ. Student,
- Both are R/o H.No.1-4-27/72/28, Padmashali Colony, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.

...PETITIONERS

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary for Home, Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad City, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad.
3. The Station House Officer, P.S. Musheerabad, Hyderabad.
4. Bikshapathi, S/o Narasimha, aged major, R/o Huts in Padmashali Colony, Bholakpur, Hyderabad.
5. Venkatesh, S/o Late Ellaiah, aged 47 years, Occ. Centring Contractor, R/o Huts in Padmashali Colony, Bholakpur, Hyderabad.
6. Shareefa Bee, W/o not known to the petitioners, aged 60 years, Occ. Employee, R/o Huts in Padmashali Colony, Bholakpur, 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 or writs, order or direction more particularly a Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents more particularly the action of the respondent, more particularly the action of the 3rd respondent in not

extending police protection to the petitioners for the construction of a structure involving stilt + 4 floors over premises No.1-4-27/72/7, 8 and 145, Padmashali Colony, Bholakpur, Hyderabad although permission is already accorded by the respondent No.4 vide construction permission No.59633/08/01/2016/HO dated 16-04-2018 and Permit No.53461/HO/CZ/CIR-09/2016 as being arbitrary, illegal and violative of Articles 14, 19 (1) (g), 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the 3rd respondent to extend police protection to petitioners for construction of a structure involving stilt + 4 floors over premises No.1-4-27/72/7, 8 and 145, Padmashali Colony, Bholakpur, Hyderabad.

IA NO: 1 OF 2018

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 No.3 to initiate steps u/s 107 Cr.P.C., pending disposal of the writ petition.

IA NO: 2 OF 2018

Between:

- 1 M.Bikshapathi, S/o Narasimha, aged about 62 years, Occ: Labour, R/o 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
- 2 Venkatesh, S/o Late Yellaiah, aged about 42 years, Occ. Building Worker, R/o 1-4-1/8/c, Rangareddi Pumpu Bavi, Basti, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
- 3 Shareefa Bee, W/o Haroon Rasheed, aged about 52 years, Occ. Employee Pvt., R/o Bholakpur, Secunderabad.

...PETITIONERS

AND

- 1 Dr. N.Madhav Rao, S/o Late N. Krishnaji Rao, aged 68 years, Occ. Doctor, R/o H.No.1-4-27/72/28, Padmashali Colony, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.
- 2 Dr. Vamshi Krishna, S/o Sri N. Madhav Rao, aged 30 years, Occ. Student, R/o H.No.1-4-27/72/28, Padmashali Colony, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.
3. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary for Home, Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad.
4. The Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad City, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad.
5. The Station House Officer, P.S. Musheerabad, Hyderabad.

...RESPONDENTS

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 Vacate the Interim Order granted in I.A. No. 1 of 2018 in WP No. 18652 of 2018 dated 07.06.2018, pending disposal of the writ petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI VIJAY B.PAROPAKARI

Counsel for the Respondent No.1 to 3: AGP FOR HOME

Counsel for the Respondent No.4 to 6: SRI D.SRINIVAS

WRIT PETITION NO: 23169 OF 2018

Between:

1. Dr. N. Madhav Rao, S/o. Late N. Krishnaji Rao, Aged 66 years, Occupation, Doctor,
 2. Dr. Vamshi Krishna, S/o. Sri. N. Madhav Rao, Aged 27 years, Occupation. Student,
- Both are R/o. H.No.1-4-27/72/28, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.

...PETITIONERS

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary for Revenue, Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The District Collector, Hyderabad District, Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad
3. The Tahsildar/Mandal Revenue Officer, Secunderabad Mandal, Hyderabad District, Telangana State.
4. M.Bikshapathi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 62 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
5. M.Ravi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 50 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
6. M.Anand, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 52 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
7. Venkatesh, S/o. Late Yellaiah, aged about 42 years, Occ: Building Worker, R/o. 1-4-1/8/c, Rangareddi pumpu Bavi, Basti, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
8. Shareefa bea, W/o. Haroon Rasheed, aged about 52 years, Occ: Employee Pvt., R/o. Bholakpur, Secunderabad.

Respondent Nos.4 to 8 are impleaded as per C.O. dt. 01.12.2025 in I.A.No.3/2018.

...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 or Writs order or direction more particularly a Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents more particularly the action of the respondent no.3 in seeking to prevent the petitioner from proceeding with the construction on the ground that until and unless the writs covered by W.P.No.150/2013, 9240/2015, 20394/16 and 18652/2018 are disposed of is questioned in this Writ Petition as being arbitrary, illegal and violative of Articles 14, 19 (1) (g), 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondent no.3 from preventing the petitioner from proceeding with construction plot no's.7, 8 and 145, Padmashali Colony, Kavadi guda, Secunderabad.

IA NO: 1 OF 2018

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 Respondents more particularly the respondent no.3 not to interfere with the construction on the plots bearing no's 7, 8 and 145 situated at Padmashali, Colony, Kavadi guda, Secunderabad pending disposal of the Writ Petition.

IA NO: 2 OF 2018

Between:

- 1 M.Bikshapathi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 62 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
- 2 M.Ravi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 50 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
- 3 M.Anand, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 52 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
- 4 Venkatesh, S/o. Late Yellaiah, aged about 42 years, Occ: Building Worker, R/o. 1-4-1/8/c, Rangareddi pumpu Bavi, Basti, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
- 5 Shareefa bea, W/o. Haroon Rasheed, aged about 52 years, Occ: Employee Pvt., R/o. Bholakpur, Secunderabad.

...PETITIONERS

AND

- 1 Dr. N. Madhav Rao, S/o. Late N. Krishnaji Rao, Aged 68 years, Occupation Retired Service, R/o. H.No.1-4-27/72/28, Padma Shari Colony, Kavadi guda, Hyderabad.

2. N.Vamshi Krishna, S/o. Dr. Sri. N.Madhav Rao, Aged 30 years, Occupation. Student, R/o. H.No.1-4-27/72/28, Padma Shari Colony, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.
3. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary for Revenue, Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad.
4. The District Collector, Hyderabad District, Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad
5. The Tahsildar/Mandal Revenue Officer, Secunderabad Mandal, Hyderabad District, Telangana State.

...RESPONDENTS

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 Vacate the Interim Orders granted in WP No. 23169 of 2018 dated 06.07.2018, pending disposal of the writ petition.

IA NO: 4 OF 2018

Between:

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary for Revenue, Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The District Collector, Hyderabad District, Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad
3. The Tahsildar/Mandal Revenue Officer, Secunderabad Mandal, Hyderabad District, Telangana State.

...PETITIONERS

AND

1. Dr. N. Madhav Rao, S/o. Late N. Krishnaji Rao, Aged 66 years, Occupation. Doctor, R/o. H.No.1-4-27/72/28, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.
2. Dr. Vamshi Krishna, S/o. Sri. N. Madhav Rao, Aged 27 years, Occupation. Student, R/o. H.No.1-4-27/72/28, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad.
3. M.Bikshapathi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 62 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
4. M.Ravi, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 50 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
5. M.Anand, S/o. Narsimha, aged about 52 years, Occ: Labour, R/o. 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
6. Venkatesh, S/o. Late Yellaiah, aged about 42 years, Occ: Building Worker, R/o. 1-4-1/8/c, Rangareddi pumpu Bavi, Basti, Bholakpur, Secunderabad.
7. Shareefa bea, W/o. Haroon Rasheed, aged about 52 years, Occ: Employee Pvt., R/o. Bholakpur, Secunderabad.

...RESPONDENTS

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 vacate the interim orders dated 06-07-2018 passed in I.A.No.1 of 2018 in W.P.No 23169 of 2018 and dismiss the writ petition, pending disposal of the writ petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI VIJAY B.PAROPAKARI

**Counsel for the Respondent No.1 to 3: SRI CHALAPATHI RAO,
GP FOR ASSIGNMENT**

Counsel for the Respondent No.4 to 8: SRI D.SRINIVAS

WRIT PETITION NO: 30511 OF 2018

Between:

1. Dr. N. Madhava Rao, S/o Late N. Krishnaji Rao, aged about 65 years, Occ. Doctor,
 2. Sri N. Vamsi Krishna, S/o Dr. N. Madhava Rao, aged about 30 years, Occ. Student,
- Both are R/o H.No.12-4-27/72/28, Kavadiguda, Secunderabad.

...PETITIONERS

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. Office of the Commissioner of Land Administration, Rep. by its Chief Commissioner, Nampally, Hyderabad.
3. The Special Officer and Competent Authority, Urban Land Ceiling, Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad.
4. The District Collector, Hyderabad District, Nampally Station Road, Hyderabad.
5. The Tahsildar/Mandal Revenue Officer, Secunderabad Mandal, Hyderabad District.
6. Bikshapathi, S/o Narsimha, Aged 62 years, Occ. Labour, R/o 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Hyderabad.
7. M.Ravi, S/o Narsimha, Aged 50 years, Occ. Labour, R/o 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Hyderabad.
8. M. Anand, S/o Narsimha, aged 52 years, Occ. Labour, R/o 1-4-1/2/A, Bholakpur, Hyderabad.
9. Venkatesh, S/o late Ellaiah, Aged 47 years, Occ. Centring Contractor.
10. Shareefa Bee, W/o not known to petitioners, aged 60 years, Occ. Employee, 9 & 10 are R/o. Huts in Padmashali Colony, Bholakpur, 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 appropriate writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring that all the proceedings giving rise to appeal No.HYD/21/1987 from the proceedings under Section 8 (4) to 10 (6) of the Urban Land Ceiling Act as null and void and in operative and not binding and consequently direct the respondents to forthwith drop all the proceedings from Section 8 (4) to 10 (6) of the Urban Land Ceiling Act.

IA NO: 1 OF 2018

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 restrain the respondent No.5 from interfering with the petitioner's construction over Plot No.7, 8 and 145 forming part of Sy.Nos.40, 41 and 42 admeasuring approximately 500 sq. yards covered by premises No.1-4-27/72/7, 1-4-27/72/8 and 1-4-27/72/145, situated at Padmashali Colony, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad, pending disposal of the main writ petition.

Counsel for the Petitioners: SRI VIJAY B.PAROPAKARI

Counsel for the Respondents: SRI CHALAPATHI RAO, GP FOR ASSIGNMENT

The Court made the following: COMMON ORDER

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

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B. VIJAYSEN REDDY

**WRIT PETITION Nos.150 of 2013, 9240 of 2015, 20394 and
36489 of 2016 and 18652, 23169 and 30511 of 2018**

Dated: 01.12.2025

Between

P. Narayana Rao and others.

...PETITIONERS

And

The Government of Andhra Pradesh,
Through the Joint Collector,
Hyderabad District and others.

...RESPONDENTS

COMMON ORDER:

Since all these writ petitions relate to a common property and connected with Urban Land Ceiling Proceedings in Appeal No.Hyd/21/1987, they petitions are being disposed of by this common order.

2. WP.No.30511 of 2018 is a comprehensive writ petition filed challenging the urban land ceiling proceedings issued under Sections 8(4) and 8(6) of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976 (for short 'ULC Act') in Appeal No.Hyd/21/1987 dated 19.02.2003.

3. WP.No.150 of 2013 is filed challenging the Endorsement No.E1/1114/2012 dated 22.03.2012 issued by the Joint Collector,

Hyderabad, on behalf of NOC Committee, in rejecting the request of the petitioners for issuance of NOC for approval of building plan for construction in land bearing Municipal Nos.1-4-27/72/7, 1-4-27/72/8 and 1-4-27/72/145, Padmashali Colony, Kavadiguda, Secunderabad.

4. WP.No.9240 of 2015 is filed to declare the action of the respondent No.3 – Tahsildar, Musheerabad Mandal and respondent No.4 – Tahsildar, Secunderabad Mandal, in treating the subject land as Government land and trying to distribute the land to landless poor as being violative of Articles 14, 19(1)(g) and 300-A of the Constitution of India.
5. WP.Nos.20394 and 36489 of 2016 are filed challenging the notices dated Nil.06.2016 and 19.10.2016 respectively whereby the petitioners were informed that the subject land in their possession has been determined as surplus and the same has been taken over by the Government under Section 10(6) of the ULC Act and requested the petitioners to file an application under G.O.Ms.No.92 Revenue (ULC) Department dated 26.05.2016 for regularization of surplus land in their possession.
6. WP.No.23169 of 2018 is filed challenging the action of the respondent No.3 – Tahsildar, Secunderabad Mandal, in seeking to

prevent the petitioners from proceeding with construction in respect of the subject property.


7. WP.No.18562 of 2018 is filed to declare the action of the respondent No.3 - Station House Officer, Musheerabad Police Station, in not extending police protection to the petitioners for construction of building in the subject property.

8. For the sake of convenience, the facts in WP.No.30511 of 2018, are set out hereunder:

(a) The wife of the petitioner No.1 purchased the subject property, i.e. Plot No.8, admeasuring 166.66 sq. yards in the name of her minor daughter, N. Vasundara, under a registered sale deed dated 17.08.1996 bearing Document No.1550/1996. After obtaining permission from the respondent No.2, the wife of the petitioner No.1 constructed a building comprising of G+1 in which they are running a 10 bedded Nursing Home under the name and style "Vasundara Nursing Home". Later, the petitioner No.1, his wife and daughter purchased Plot No.7 in the name of Sri. P. Narayan Rao under a registered sale deed dated Nil.03.2003 bearing Document No.70/2003. Similarly, Sri. Narayan Rao and petitioner No.1 purchased an extent of 240 sq. yards covered by Plot No.145, partly in the name of Sri. Narayan Rao and partly in their name.

All these three plots are in compact block wherein the Nursing Home is constructed and being run by the petitioners.

(b) It is stated that the land admeasuring Ac.6.09 guntas in Sy.Nos.40, 41 and 42, of Padmashali Colony, Kavadiguda, Hyderabad, was originally classified as Inam land. Basing on the application made by the Padmashali Co-operative Housing Society Limited (for short 'the Society') under Section 8 read with Section 10 of the A.P. (Telangana Area) Abolition of Inams Act, 1965, Occupancy Right Certificate was granted by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Hyderabad Western Division in File No.A1/128/1976 dated 03.12.1977. Thereafter, mutation of the subject property was effected by the Thasildar, Secunderabad in File No.F1/11861/1977 dated 30.12.1977. The Society applied to the then Hyderabad Municipal Corporation for approval and sanction of layout covering the entire extent of Ac.6.09 guntas. The Special Officer, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad (Town Planning Section) in his Proceedings dated 31.05.1977 addressed to the President of Society, asked to demarcate the roads, plots and boundaries in accordance with the revised and corrected layout. The then Government of Andhra Pradesh in accordance with G.OMs.No.836 Municipal Administration dated 07.10.1978 favourably considered the request of the Society to relax the rules under the MCH layout Rules, 1965 and the Building Laws 1972. It is stated that when the



petitioners intended to apply for new building permission, the MCH insisted the petitioners to get NOC from the NOC Committee chaired by the Joint Collector, Hyderabad.

(c) It is stated that on enquiries by the Petitioners, it was revealed that the Society had filed a declaration under Section 6(1) of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976 (for short 'the ULC Act'), claiming among other lands, the land in Sy.Nos.39 to 42, on the basis of the ORC granted by the Tribunal under the Abolition of Inams Act. The layout of the Society was declared surplus. The Society carried the matter in Appeal under Section 33 of the Act before the Commissioner of Appeals registered as Appeal No.Hyd/21/1987. The appeal was dismissed on 19.02.2003. However, the Society did not question the order of the Appellate authority.

(d) It is stated that WP.No.8729 of 2003 was filed by the Vasudevamma Charitable Trust challenging the order dated 19.02.2003 of the Appellate authority and this Court granted status-quo on 02.05.2003. A counter was filed by the Special Thasildar, Zone-II, wherein it is clearly averred that "in view of the status-quo granted by this Hon'ble Court further proceedings in respect of the land could not be taken up". In the meanwhile, the ULC Act was repealed on 27.03.2008. As possession was not

taken, WP.No.8729 of 2003 was dismissed as withdrawn by order dated 16.02.2012.

(e) It is stated that the respondents, allegedly, have taken possession on 27.03.2008, the date on which, the ULC Act was repealed and even when status-quo order passed in WP.No.8729 of 2003 was in force. The alleged surplus land was not at all inspected on ground and a paper panchanama was conducted. The alleged notice under Section 10(5) of the ULC Act was issued to the GPA of the Declarant and not to the possessors including the petitioners. The respondent authorities were aware that the Society was agitating its rights in Appeal No.Hyd/21/1987, but neither the Society nor any of its members were issued notice under Section 10(5) of the Act. The respondent No.5 has issued notice under Section 6 of the Land Encroachment Act, which was challenged in WP.No.26703 of 2018 wherein status quo order was passed.

9. In the counter affidavit filed by the respondent No.1 in WP.No.150 of 2013, it is stated that that the President of Padmashali Cooperative Housing Society and one P. Visweswara Reddy, GPA of B. Ranga Reddy, who was recorded as Inamdar in Column No.20 of T.S.L.R, filed a statement in Form I in CC.No.H1/12581/76 and H2/13951/76 declaring the land in Sy.Nos.39 to 42 and 77, 78 of Bolakpur Village. As per the revenue records, above survey numbers stand as patta lands in the name of

Sri B. Ranga Reddy. As M/s. Padmashali Cooperative Housing Society failed to produce any documentary evidence in support of their claim, the total extent of the land declared was computed to the holding of Sri. B. Ranga Reddy and draft orders under Section 8(1) of the ULC Act were issued determining 1,80,821.83 sq. meters in excess of the ceiling limits.

10. It is stated that in response to the draft statement under Section 8 (1) and notice under Section 8(3) of the ULC Act, objections were filed by Sri B. Vijaya Reddy, LR of late B. Ranga Reddy, Sri Vishveshwar Reddy, GPA and LR of late B. Ranga Reddy; and trustee of Vasudevamma Charitable Trust, Sri P. Bala Narsaiah and Sri T.A Chary, President of M/s Padmashali Cooperative Housing Society. Objections raised by the declarants and other persons were examined on their merits. The objection petitioners did not produce any record or evidence in support of their claims. Therefore, the draft statement under Section 8(1) of the ULC Act was confirmed without any alterations and final orders under Section 8(4) and final statement under Section 9 of the ULC Act were issued vide proceedings dated 30.09.1986 declaring the declarants as excess holders to an extent of 1,08,821-83 sq. meters.

11. It is stated that later the case was processed further and notification under Section 10(1) of the ULC Act was issued and got published in AP Gazette No.102 dated 04.05.1987 and declaration under Section 10(3) of the ULC Act was also issued and got published in AP Gazette No.139 dated 14.07.1987 vesting the surplus land with the Government free from all encumbrances. Later, possession of the land was taken over under Section 10(6) of the ULC Act on 27.03.2008 under cover of panchanama to an extent of 64,964.26 sq. meters, which includes the land of the writ petitioners.

12. It is stated that the request of petitioners for issue of No Objection Certificate was rejected by the Committee Constituted under G.O.Ms.No.2111, Revenue (Assn.III) Department, dated 05.12.2005 and G.O.Ms.No.93, Revenue (Assn.III) Department, dated 28.01-2006 in the meeting held on 13.03.2012 and Endorsement No.E1/1114/2012 dated 22.03.2012 was issued rejecting request of the petitioners. It is further stated that the petitioners have not filed any application for regularization of land under relevant GO's before Special Officer and Competent Authority, ULC. In respect of the averments that no appeal was filed before appellate authority and also appeal against O.S.No.1314 of 2009 it is submitted that this respondent is not a party in those cases.

13. Mr. Vijay B. Paropakari, learned counsel for the petitioners, submitted that the impugned proceedings are illegal, arbitrary and unsustainable. It is not in dispute that the petitioners are in possession of the subject land, which is evident from the notices Nil.06.2016 and 19.10.2016 (subject matter of WP.Nos.20394 and 36489 of 2016) wherein possession of the petitioners was admitted. There is building constructed in the subject property. Physical possession was not taken from the petitioners. Status quo order granted in WP.No.8729 of 2003 was in force as on 27.03.2008. Even if the vendors of the petitioners, Society, has not filed any writ petition, it is relevant to state that WP.No.8729 of 2003 was filed by one G. Vijaya Reddy, challenging common order dated 19.02.2003 in Appeal Nos.Hyd/20/198 and Hyd/21/1987. Status quo order was granted in respect of the entire property belonging to the original declarant. In view of the status quo order, possession was not taken as admitted in the counter in WP.No.150 of 2013. The alleged panchanama is a fictitious document. Notice under Section 10(5) of the ULC Act has not been issued to the petitioners, who are, admittedly, in possession. Further, there is no document filed by the respondent authorities to show that notice under Section 10(5) of the ULC Act has been issued to the declarants and possessors of the subject property. Thus, the impugned orders are liable to be set aside.

14. Mr. Chalapathi Rao, learned Government Pleader for Assignment, submitted that neither the petitioners nor their vendors have chosen to file a writ petition challenging the common order dated 19.02.2003 in Appeal Nos.Hyd/20/198 and Hyd/21/1987. The writ petition was filed only by the appellant in Appeal No.Hyd/21/1987 and status quo order passed therein would be applicable only to him and not to the petitioners or their vendors – Society.

Discussion and Analysis:

15. It is borne out from the record that WP.No.8729 of 2003 filed by Vasudevamma Charitable Trust and Vishveshwar Reddy, S/o. Ranga Reddy, challenging the common order dated 19.02.2003 in Commissioner Appeals Prog. No.HYD/20 & 21/87 passed by the Court of the Commissioner, Appeals, Office of the Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, Hyderabad. On the statement by the learned counsel for the petitioners that no further orders are necessary to be passed, the writ petition was dismissed by order dated 16.02.2012. In the counter filed in WP.No.8729 of 2003, Ex.P7, at Para 8, it was stated that draft statement under Section 8(1) of the ULC Act was confirmed on 30.09.1986; the declarant was held to be surplus holder to an extent of 108821.83 sq. meters; the declaration under Section 10(3) of the ULC Act was published on 14.07.1987; the entire surplus land

vested with the Government free from all encumbrances and that in view of the status quo order granted by this Court, proceedings in respect of the land could not be taken up.

16. The counter was filed on 01.06.2007 along with vacate stay petition. The ULC Act was repealed in the State of AP with effect from 27.03.2008. As possession was, admittedly, not taken, the counsel for the petitioners in WP.No.8729 of 2003 reported before this Court that no orders are necessary and as stated above, the writ petition was dismissed on 16.02.2012.

17. Learned Government Pleader for Assignment did not rebut the statement of the learned counsel for the petitioners that the ULC proceedings, which culminated in the order dated 19.02.2003 in Appeal Nos.Hyd/20 and 21/87, so far as other appellants (Vasudevamma Charitable Trust represented by its Trustee, Vishveshwar Reddy and B. Vishveshwar Reddy, S/o. B. Ranga Reddy) stood abated by virtue of Section 4 of the Repeal Act. Thus, it is clear that the land in possession of the petitioners in WP.No.8729 of 2003 was not taken, which is evident from para 8 of the counter affidavit therein.

18. It is surprising to note that the respondent No.1 though asserted that they have taken possession of the subject land from the petitioners on 27.03.2008 (date of repeal of ULC Act in the

State of AP), no details of service of notice under Section 10(5) of the ULC Act are mentioned in the counter affidavit. In para 4(ii) of the counter, it is stated that Section 10(1) notification was issued on 04.05.1987; declaration was issued and got published on 14.07.1989 and possession was taken over under Section 10(6) of the ULC Act on 27.03.2008.

19. The record in H2/13951/76 produced by the learned Government Pleader for Assignment has been verified by this Court and it is found that Section 10(5) notice dated 25.02.2008 (page No.1471), though prepared in the name of Vishweshwar Reddy, has not been dispatched. There is no evidence whatsoever to show that notice has been dispatched through registered post or served on the declarant/family members/legal heirs in person. Further, as stated in para 15 above, it is clear that possession has not been taken from the petitioners in WP.No.8729 of 2003.

20. The record does not disclose that any Section 10(5) notice has been issued in the name of the petitioners or their vendors. Thus, it is very much apparent that the respondent authorities could not take possession of the subject land as status quo order dated 02.05.2003 was passed in respect of both appeals i.e. Appeal Nos.Hyd/20 and 21/87 filed by B. Vishweshwar Reddy and M/s. Padmasali Co-operative House Building Society, respectively.

21. It has been held by the Supreme Court in **STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH v. HARI RAM**¹ that notice under Section 10(5) of the ULC Act is mandatory and the relevant paras are extracted hereunder:

"Peaceful dispossession"

34. Sub-section (5) of Section 10, for the first time, speaks of "possession" which says where any land is vested in the State Government under sub-section (3) of Section 10, the competent authority may, by notice in writing, order any person, who may be in possession of it to surrender or transfer possession to the State Government or to any other person, duly authorized by the State Government.

35. If de facto possession has already passed on to the State Government by the two deeming provisions under sub-section (3) to Section 10, there is no necessity of using the expression "where any land is vested" under sub-section (5) to Section 10. Surrendering or transfer of possession under sub-section (3) to Section 10 can be voluntary so that the person may get the compensation as provided under Section 11 of the Act early. Once there is no voluntary surrender or delivery of possession, necessarily the State Government has to issue notice in writing under sub-section (5) to Section 10 to surrender or deliver possession. Subsection (5) of Section 10 visualizes a situation of surrendering and delivering possession, peacefully while sub-section (6) of Section 10 contemplates a situation of forceful dispossession.

Forceful dispossession

36. The Act provides for forceful dispossession but only when a person refuses or fails to comply with an order

¹ (2013) 4 SCC 280

under sub-section (5) of Section 10. Sub-section (6) to Section 10 again speaks of "possession" which says, if any person refuses or fails to comply with the order made under sub-section (5), the competent authority may take possession of the vacant land to be given to the State Government and for that purpose, force - as may be necessary - can be used. Sub-section (6), therefore, contemplates a situation of a person refusing or fails to comply with the order under sub-section (5), in the event of which the competent authority may take possession by use of force. Forcible dispossession of the land, therefore, is being resorted only in a situation which falls under sub-section (6) and not under sub-section (5) to Section 10. Sub-sections (5) and (6), therefore, take care of both the situations, i.e. taking possession by giving notice that is "peaceful dispossession" and on failure to surrender or give delivery of possession under Section 10(5), than "forceful dispossession" under sub-section (6) of Section 10.

37. The requirement of giving notice under sub-sections (5) and (6) of Section 10 is mandatory. Though the word 'may' has been used therein, the word 'may' in both the sub-sections has to be understood as "shall"

because a court charged with the task of enforcing the statute needs to decide the consequences that the legislature intended to follow from failure to implement the requirement. Effect of non-issue of notice under sub-section (5) or sub-section (6) of Section 11 is that it might result the land holder being dispossessed without notice, therefore, the word 'may' has to be read as 'shall'."

22. In view of the above discussion, as Section 10(5) notice and Section 10(6) order has not been served on the petitioners and moreover, as the notice dated 19.10.2016 and notices dated

Nil.06.2016 (WP.Nos.20394 and 36489 of 2016) beyond doubt prove petitioners are in physical and actual possession of the subject lands, this Court does not have any hesitation to hold that the alleged panchanama dated 27.03.2008 is a paper possession and illegal. Since the possession of the subject land has not been taken over from the petitioners, the ULC proceedings so far as subject land is concerned stood abated by virtue of Section 4 of the Repeal Act.

23. Accordingly, the writ petitions are allowed and the proceedings No.E1/1114/2012 dated 22.03.2012, proceedings dated 19.10.2016 and notices dated Nil.06.2016 are quashed. The respondent authorities are directed to consider the building applications of the petitioners without reference to the ULC proceedings in CC.No.H2/13951/76.

The miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

That Rule Nisi has made Absolute as above witness
The Hon'ble SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH, The Chief Justice on this Monday,
the First Day of December, Two Thousand and Twenty Five.

//TRUE COPY//

SD/-MOHD. ISMAIL
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Secretary for Revenue, Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad, State of Telangana - 500 022.
2. The Principal Secretary for Home, Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad, State of Telangana.
3. The Commissioner, Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation, Tank Bund Road, Hyderabad.


4. The Special Officer and Competent authority, Urban Land Ceiling, Nampally, Road, Hyderabad.
5. The Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad City, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad.
6. The Chief Commissioner, Office of the Commissioner of Land Administration, Nampally, Hyderabad.
7. The Joint Collector, Hyderabad District, Government of Telangana. (On behalf of NOC Committee)
8. The District Collector, Hyderabad District, Nampally, Hyderabad-500 001.
9. The Tahsildar, Musheerabad Mandal, Hyderabad District, Hyderabad -500 020.
10. The Tahsildar/Mandal Revenue Officer, Secunderabad Mandal, Hyderabad District, Telangana State.
11. The Station House Officer, P.S. Musheerabad, Hyderabad.
12. One CC to SRI VIJAY B. PAROPAKARI, Advocate [OPUC]
13. One CC to SRI D. SRINIVAS, Advocate [OPUC]
14. One CC to SRI G. MADHUSUDHAN REDDY, SC FOR GHMC [OPUC]
15. Two CCs to GP FOR ASSIGNMENT, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad [OUT]
16. Two CCs to GP FOR HOME, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad [OUT]
17. Two CD Copies

BSR
BS

CC TODAY

HIGH COURT

DATED: 01/12/2025



COMMON ORDER

WP.Nos.150 of 2013, 9240 of 2015, 20394 and 36489
of 2016 and 18652, 23169 and 30511 of 2018

ALLOWING ALL THE WRIT PETITIONS,
WITHOUT COSTS

(21) MT
19/12/25