

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE: L.A.A.S(SR).No.53219 of 2024

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
02.	04.05.2026	<u>KL, J & BRMR, J</u> This appeal is filed under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 challenging the order dated 08.12.2023 in L.A.O.P.No.17 of 2025 passed by the learned Senior Civil Judge, Nirmal. <i>Vide</i> the aforesaid order, learned Civil Court answered the reference holding that Sri P.Laxmi Narsaiah and Sri Kadupuganti Narsaiah are entitled to receive the compensation amount as per the registered sale deed bearing Document No.P/5/2012, dated 02.04.2012 bearing sale deed No.722/2012 of SRO, Khanapur, having title over the disputed land. Perusal of record would reveal that challenging the said order, the appellant preferred an appeal under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 before the learned Principal District Judge, Nirmal. <i>Vide</i> Docket Order, dated 03.12.2025, learned Principal District Judge, Nirmal, returned the bundle holding that the appeal preferred under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 lies to the High Court. Therefore, appellants preferred the present appeal. The Registry of this Court raised the following objections:	

¹ AIR 1970 GUJ 37

		"Please verify and clarify as to how this LAAS SR is entertainable before this Hon'ble Court, upon which First Appeal lies under Section 96 of CPC before the concerned District Court, since the LAOP was filed under Section 30 and 31 (2) of L. A. Act for Title Dispute, with the Court Fee of Rs.300/- is to be paid." Learned counsel for the appellants re-presented the bundle with the following explanation: "It is submitted that originally the appellants filed AS CFR No. 145 of 2025 before the learned Principal District Judge, at Nirmal against the Orders of learned Senior Civil Judge, at Nirmal in L.A.O.P. No. 17 of 2023, dated 08-12-2023, which is under Section 30 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 invoking under Section 96 of CPC. In AS CFR No.145 of 2025, the learned Principal District Judge, at Nirmal held that appeal lies under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act 1894, that too before the Hon'ble High Court and hence appeal was not numbered stopped at SR stage and directed to file an appeal before Hon'ble High Court. That accordingly, this appeal is preferred." As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the appellants, against the impugned order, an appeal under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 lies. Therefore, learned Principal District Judge, Nirmal, granted liberty to the appellants to submit the bundle before proper Court, having jurisdiction. The appeal filed by the appellants under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 lies to this Court. The said principle was also laid down in <i>Bai Lalita v. Shardaben and others</i>¹. In the light of the same, objection raised by the Registry is over-ruled. Therefore, the Registry is	
--	--	---	--

		directed to number the present appeal, if the same is otherwise in order, and list it for admission. KL, J BRMR, J pns	
--	--	---	--