

(SHOW CAUSE NOTICE BEFORE ADMISSION)
HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA, AT HYDERABAD

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF NOVEMBER,

TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE E.V. VENUGOPAL

WRIT PETITION NO: 35499 OF 2025

Between:

The Pubic Health Foundation of India, Rep. by its Head Legal Procurement,
Ms.Neha Tomar, PHD House, 2nd Floor, 4/2, Siri Fort Institutional Area, August
Kranti Marg, New Delhi - 110 016.

...Petitioner

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary Department of Revenue, Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, Government of Telangana, Nampally, Hyderabad.
3. The District Collector, Ranga Reddy District at Kongara Kalan.
4. The Deputy Collector and Tahsildar, Rajendranagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.
5. The Musi Riverfront Development Corporation Limited., Rep. by its Managing Director, Hyderabad, ENC-PH Building, MA&UD Campus, Masab Tank, Hyderabad.

...Respondents

WHEREAS the Petitioner above named through its Advocate Sri PAIDA PRATIK REDDY presented this 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 direction, more particularly one in the nature of Mandamus, declaring the action of the 1st Respondent herein in issuing the impugned G.O.Ms. No. 138, Revenue (Land Administration - II) Department, dated 27.10.2025 ordering resumption of land admeasuring Ac. 43.04 Gts. in Sy.Nos. 374, 376, 377, 384, 388, 389, 390, 391 and 387 in Premavathipet Village, Rajendranagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, that has been allotted to the Petitioner herein, as arbitrary, wholly without jurisdiction, illegal, violative of Articles 14, 19(1)(g) and 300-A of the Constitution of India, and consequently set aside the same, to the extent that it applies to the Petitioner herein.

AND WHEREAS the High Court upon perusing the petition and affidavit filed herein and upon hearing the arguments of Sri PAIDA PRATIK REDDY Advocate for the Petitioner and Government Pleader for Revenue for Respondent Nos.1 to 4

directed issue of notice to the Respondent No.5 to show cause as to why this WRIT PETITION should not be admitted.

You viz:

The Managing Director, Musi Riverfront Development Corporation Limited.,
Hyderabad, ENC-PH Building, MA&UD Campus, Masab Tank, Hyderabad.

are directed to show cause on or before 19.12.2025 to which date the case stands posted as to why in the circumstances set out in the petition and the affidavit filed therewith (copy enclosed) this WRIT PETITION should not be admitted.

IA 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 stay the operation of the impugned G.O.Ms. No. 138, Revenue (Land Administration - II) Department, dated 27.10.2025, to the extent that it applies to the Petitioner herein, pending disposal of WP No. 35499 of 2025, on the file of the High Court.

The Court made the following ORDER:

Notice before admission.

Sri L.Ravinder, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, takes notice for respondent Nos.1 to 4, waives further notice and seeks time to get instructions.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to take out personal notice to respondent No.5 by Speed Post with Acknowledgment Due and file proof of service before the Registry by the next date of listing.

Sri B.Mayur Reddy, learned counsel representing Sri Paida Pratik Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that this is a third round of litigation and earlier this Court while disposing of the Writ Petition i.e., W.P.No.4702 of 2009, dated 27.06.2011, after analyzing the issues raised therein, has categorically held that "being satisfied that alienation in question is in public interest, therefore exercise of discretion under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is not called for. Learned Senior Counsel would further submit that in the second round of litigation, as against the notice of resuming the land alienated to the petitioner, the petitioner filed W.P.No.28783 of 2013 and by an order, dated 04.10.2013, this Court *prima facie* opined that the impugned notice is a result of patent arbitrary exercise of power by respondent No.4 therein and the same was accordingly suspended pending further orders and the said writ petition is pending for further adjudication. In

the meanwhile, respondent No.1 had issued the G.O. vide G.O.Ms.No.138, dated 27.10.2025, for resumption of the petitioner's land as stated in the said G.O. along with other lands covered in the said G.O. Learned Senior Counsel would further submit that firstly the petitioner is not a Government institution as stated in the said G.O. and secondly the petitioner organization is functioning in the service of public interest. Learned Senior Counsel would further submit that without issuing any notice the impugned G.O. has been issued, which is perverse and violative of principles of natural justice.

On the other hand, Sri T.Rajanikanth Reddy, learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents would submit that as the notice issued by respondent No.4 is a result of patent arbitrary exercise of power the same was suspended pending further orders in W.P.No.28738 of 2013 and this Court has not come to the conclusion that the official respondents do not have any power to resume the land. He would further submit that in the year, 2016 a notice was issued to the petitioner, which was not challenged by the petitioner nor issued any reply. He would further submit that the impugned G.O. has been issued for resuming the petitioner's land and further ordered to allocate alternate lands to the petitioner and other institutions in HMDA Layout developed at Shamshabad Village and Mandal and Future City. He would further submit that no harm would be caused to the petitioner in resuming the land and to shift it in the land allocated to it and due to urbanization only the said action has been taken.

In view of the above submissions and since the learned Additional Advocate General has submitted that the resumption of petitioner's land was already done whereas the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner would submit that no resumption is done, the matter needs to be a detailed examination. It is also necessary to verify that the notice is said to have been issued by the official respondents in the year 2016 and action thereon.

Further, W.P.No.28738 of 2013 is pending before this Court, it is appropriate to direct the Registry to connect this writ petition along with W.P.No.28738 of 2013 after obtaining necessary directions from the Hon'ble the Chief Justice.

List on 19.12.2025.

Till such time, both the parties are directed to maintain *status quo* obtaining as on today in all respects.

SD/-U.SUDHA
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//


SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Secretary Department of Revenue, State of Telangana, Dr.B.R.Ambedkar Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, Government of Telangana, Nampally, Hyderabad.
3. The District Collector, Ranga Reddy District at Kongara Kalan.
4. The Deputy Collector and Tahsildar, Rajendranagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District (Addresses 1 to 4 by RPAD)
5. The Musi Riverfront Development Corporation Limited., Rep. by its Managing Director, Hyderabad, ENC-PH Building, MA and UD Campus, Masab Tank, Hyderabad (by RPAD- along with a copy of petition and affidavit)
6. One CC to SRI. PAIDA PRATIK REDDY Advocate [OPUC]
7. One CC to ADDL ADVOCATE GENERAL Advocate [OPUC]
8. Two CCs to Government Pleader for Revenue, High Court, Hyderabad [OUT]
9. One spare copy

HIGH COURT

EVVJ

DATED:21/11/2025

LIST ON 19.12.2025



NOTICE BEFORE ADMISSION

WP.No.35499 of 2025

STATUS QUO