

ITEM NO.12

COURT NO.12

SECTION XIIA

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 10946/2013

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 27/12/2012 in WA No. 479/2010 passed by the High Court Of A.P. At Hyderabad)

WATERMARKE ESTATES PVT. LTD. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

HYDERABAD METROPOLITAN DEV. AUTHORITY &ANR. Respondent(s)

(with appln. (s) for bring on record subsequent event and intervention and permission to file synopsis and list of dates and nterim relief and office report)

WITH

S.L.P.(C)...CC No. 10232/2013

(With appln.(s) for permission to file additional documents and appln.(s) for c/delay in filing SLP and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 10944/2013
Interim Relief and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 11043-11044/2013
Interim Relief and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 11048/2013
(With appln.(s) for permission to bring additional facts and documents on record and appln.(s) for permission to file lengthy list of dates and Interim Relief and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 11051/2013
(With appln.(s) for permission to file lengthy list of dates and appln.(s) for permission to place addl. documents on record and Interim Relief and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 11145-11146/2013
Interim Relief and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 12134/2013
(With appln.(s) for permission to bring on record subsequent facts

Signature Not Verified

and documents and appln.(s) for permission to file lengthy list of
Digitally signed by
ASHWANI KUMAR
Date: 2016.04.26

dates and Interim Relief and Office Report)
10:38:55 IST
Reason:

SLP(C) No. 12900/2013
(With appln.(s) for directions and appln.(s) for permission to place addl. documents on record and Interim Relief and Office

Report)

SLP(C) No. 15628/2013
Interim Relief and Office Report)

Date : 19/04/2016 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. SIKRI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.K. AGRAWAL

For Petitioner(s) Mr. T. Sirinivasa Murthiy, Adv.
Mr. Senthil Jagadeesan, Adv.
Ms. Shruti Iyer, Adv.

Mr. Ansar Ahmad Chaudhary, Adv.

Mr. T. Srinivasa Murthy, Adv.
Mr. Deeptakirti Verma, Adv.

Mr. S. Hari Haran, Adv.
Mr. Vikash Singh, Adv.

Mr. H.S. Chandhok, Adv.
Mr. Prashant Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Abhay Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Harish Vaidyanathan Shankar, Adv.
Ms. Nisha Mohandas, Adv.
Mr. Vadivelu Deenadayalan, Adv.

Mr. Guru Krishna Kumar, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Shikha Sandhu, Adv.
Ms. Sneha Rani Iyer, Adv.
Mr. S. R. Setia, Adv.

Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Gautam Narayan, Adv.
Mr. R.A. Iyer, Adv.
Mr. Shatrajit Banerji, Adv.
Mr. K. Anshjuraj, Adv.
Mr. S. Ghose, Adv.

Mr. Annam D. N. Rao, Adv.
Mr. Sudipto Sircar, Adv.
Ms. Ankita Chadha, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Annam Venkatesh, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. V. Giri, Sr. Adv.
Mr. K. Ramakrishna Reddi, AG
Mr. T.V. Ratnam, Adv.

3

Mr. K. Ramakrishna Reddi, AG
Mr. S. Udaya Kumar Sagar, Adv.
Mr. Krishna Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Prabhu Patel, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Y. Raja Gopala Rao, Adv.
Ms. Y. Vismai Rao, Adv.
Mr. Hitender Nath Ratnam, Adv.
Mr. Sharat Kumar, Adv.

M/s. Venkat Palwai Law Associates

Mr. H.S. Chandhok, Adv.
Mr. P. Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Parul Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Abhay Kumar, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

We have heard the arguments for some time. During the course of arguments, it transpires that one KSB Ali has filed a writ petition in the High Court on behalf of 203 legal heirs of Late Nawab Nusrath Jung Bahadur challenging the auction of the land, which is the subject matter of these petitions. The writ petition was allowed by the learned Single Judge of the High Court and the Division Bench of the High Court reversed the said order holding that the writ petition filed by Mr. Ali raised disputed questions of fact which could not have been gone into in these proceedings. The said order of the High Court has been challenged by Mr. Ali by filing SLP(C) No. 18755-18756 of 2013 in which notice has been issued and in the meantime, interim order is passed directing status quo with regard to subject property to be maintained by all concerned in all respects. In this way, the said status quo order has bearing on these matters as well. Therefore, it would be in the

4

fitness of things if these petitions are heard after the decision in SLP(C) No. 18755-18756 of 2013 or that Special Leave Petition is also heard along with these petitions.

Learned counsel for the parties state that they shall mention the matter to Hon'ble the Chief Justice for passing appropriate order in this respect.

List for further arguments on 26.04.2016.

(Ashwani Thakur)
COURT MASTER

(Tapan Kr. Chakraborty)
COURT MASTER