

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

**FRIDAY, THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF OCTOBER  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE MOUSHUMI BHATTACHARYA  
AND**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE GADI PRAVEEN KUMAR**

**WRIT APPEAL NO: 1084 OF 2025**

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent Preferred Against the Order Dated 16/09/2025, in W.P.No.22495 of 2025 on the file of the High Court.

**Between:**

MUPPU SHYAMALA, W/o. M. Pratap Reddy, Aged about 56 years, Occ. Housewife, R/o.1-7-317/C-10, Kamala Nagar, ECIL Post, Hyderabad - 500062.

**.....APPELLANT/PETITIONER**

**AND**

1. THE STATE OF TELANGANA, Represented by Principal Secretary, Department of Municipal Administration and Urban Development, Hyderabad, Telangana At Secretariate.
2. THE HYDERABAD METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, Represented by its Commissioner, Swarna Jayanti Complex, S.R. Nagar, Srinivasa Nagar, Ameerpet, Hyderabad - 500038. Telangana,
3. THE NAGARAM MUNICIPALITY, Represented by its Commissioner, Nagaram Village, Keesara Mandal, Medchal-Malkajgiri District.
4. SHARAD KUMAR MISRA, S/o Jyoti Prakash Misra, Aged Major, Occ. Business, R/o. H.No.12-10-52/1, Seethaphalmandi, Secunderabad, Hyderabad-500061.
5. KOPPALLI NAGENDRA BABU, S/o Subbarayudu, Aged Major, Occ. Business, R/o. H.No.12-10-52/1, Seethaphalmandi, Secunderabad, Hyderabad-500061.
6. SMT GURRAM NAGALAKSHMI, W/o VENKATESWARLU, Aged Major, Occ. Housewife, R/o. H.No.12-10-52/1, Seethaphalmandi, Secunderabad, Hyderabad-500061.
7. SMT PETTUGANI VENKATA SUJATHA, W/o VENKATESWARLU, Aged major, Occ. Housewife, R/o. H.No.12-10-52/1, Seethaphalmandi, Secunderabad, Hyderabad-500061.

.....RESPONDENTS

**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 SUSPEND the Order Dated 16/09/2025 in W.P. No. 22495 OF 2025 on the file of Honourable Single Judge.

**I.A.NO:3 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 Nos. 4 to 7 not to proceed for further construction till the disposal of Representation Dated 24/07/2025 pending for the Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 pending disposal of the above writ appeal.

**Counsel for Appellant : SRI C.RAGHU, Sr. COUNSEL, REP. FOR  
SRI K.PRADEEP REDDY**

**Counsel for Respondent No.1 : GP FOR MCPL ADMN AND URBAN  
DEVEVLOPMENT**

**Counsel for Respondent No.2 : SRI V.NARASIMHA GOUD**

**Counsel for Respondent No.3 : SRI PUTTA KRISHNA REDDY**

**Counsel for Respondent Nos.4 to 7 : SRI JALLI KANAKAIAH**

**The Court made the following JUDGMENT : -**

**THE HON'BLE JUSTICE MOUSHUMI BHATTACHARYA  
AND  
THE HON'BLE JUSTICE GADI PRAVEEN KUMAR**

**WRIT APPEAL NO.1084 OF 2025**

Mr.C.Raghu, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr.K Pradeep Reddy, learned counsel appearing for the appellant.

Mr.Krishna Reddy Putta, the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondent No.3.

Mr.Jalli Kanakaih, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the respondent Nos.4 to 7.

**JUDGMENT:** (Per Hon'ble Justice Moushumi Bhattacharya)

1. We have heard learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the respondent Nos.4 to 7 and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondent No.3.
2. The Appeal was filed challenging the order dated 16.09.2025 passed in W.P.No.22495 of 2025. The appellant had filed W.P.No.22495 of 2025 against the inaction of the respondents, in particular the respondent Nos.2 and 3, in not considering the appellant's Representation dated 24.07.2025 containing a request for cancellation of the building permission dated 08.07.2025 bearing No.000804/BP/HMDA/0217/GHT/2025 granted by the respondent Nos.2 and 3 in favour of the respondent Nos.4

to 7 on the ground that such permission had been obtained by suppression and misrepresentation of order dated 10.01.2020 in I.A.No.3856 of 2019 in O.S.No.332 of 2019 on the file of the I Additional Junior Civil Judge, Medchal-Malkajgiri District at Medchal granting *status quo* till filing of counter with respect to changing the nature of the petition schedule property.

3. By the impugned order dated 16.09.2025, the learned Single Judge disposed of the Writ Petition while permitting the appellant to proceed with the impleadment of the respondent Nos.4 to 7 in a pending Suit (O.S.No.332 of 2019) filed by the appellant for declaration and recovery of possession of the suit schedule property but declining to restrain the respondent Nos.4 to 7 from proceeding with further construction in the subject property. The appellant was also given liberty to pursue I.A.No.3856 of 2019 filed in the said Suit seeking *ad-interim* injunction orders or other interlocutory applications, restraining the respondent Nos.4 to 7 from proceeding with further construction and thereafter, approach the respondent No.3-Nagaram Municipality for cancellation of building permission or

keeping in abeyance the building permission granted to the respondent Nos.4 to 7 in case such a restraint order is passed. The I Additional Junior Civil Judge, Medchal-Malkajgiri District was also directed to dispose of the application in I.A.No.3856 of 2019 or any other application filed by the appellant seeking injunction, within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of that order.

4. We do not find any reason for the appellant being aggrieved by the impugned order since admittedly, in spite of the first suit in O.S.No.721 of 1996 filed seeking declaration of title and perpetual injunction in the Court of VI Additional Senior Civil Judge, Medchal, Ranga Reddy District having been dismissed on 10.11.2017, the second Suit in O.S.No.332 of 2019, filed in 2019, is still pending as on date before the learned XVI Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy District at Malkajgiri.

5. The Court is informed that the appellant has already filed an implead petition to bring the respondent Nos.4 to 7 on record in the suit in O.S.No.332 of 2019.

6. We are of the considered view that the appellant's effective remedy for restraining the respondents from

2 further construction, lies in pursuing the pending Suit and the I.A. filed therein.

7. None of the appellant's rights have been affected by the impugned order dated 16.09.2025.

8. Therefore, the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge dated 16.09.2025 does not warrant any interference.

9. W.A.No.1084 of 2025, along with all connected applications, is accordingly disposed of in terms of the above. There shall be no order as to costs.

**//TRUE COPY//**

**SD/- A.V.S.PRASAD  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR**

**SECTION OFFICER**

**To**

1. The Principal Secretary, Department of Municipal Administration and Urban Development, Hyderabad, Telangana State Of Telangana at Secretariate.
2. The Commissioner, HYDERABAD METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, Swarna Jayanti Complex, S.R. Nagar, Srinivasa Nagar, Ameerpet, Hyderabad - 500038. Telangana.
3. The Commissioner, NAGARAM MUNICIPALITY, Nagaram Village, Keesara Mandal, Medchal-Malkajgiri District.
4. Two CCs to GP FOR MCPL ADMN AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad. [OUT]
5. One CC to SRI K.PRADEEP REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
6. One CC to SRI V.NARASIMHA GOUD, Advocate (OPUC)
7. One CC to SRI JALLI KANAKAIAH, Advocate (OPUC)
8. One CC to SRI PUTTA KRISHNA REDDY, Advocate (OPUC)
9. Two CD Copies

**SA**

*PA*

HIGH COURT

DATED:24/10/2025

JUDGMENT

WA.No.1084 of 2025



DISPOSING OF THE W.A  
WITHOUT COSTS.

12 PA  
01/11/25