

[ 3446 ]

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

**MONDAY, THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF MARCH  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE SUJOY PAUL  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE RENUKA YARA**

**WRIT APPEAL NO: 323 OF 2025**

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent Preferred Against Order  
Dated 03/03/2025 in WP.No.18561 of 2017. on the file of the High Court.

**Between:**

B. Narasimha Reddy, S/o. Late B. Satti Reddy Aged about 85 years,  
Occ. Agriculture R/o. H.No.11-10-19, Road No.2 SBI Colony, Kothapet,  
Ranga Reddy District.

**...APPELLANT**

**AND**

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary Municipal Administration and Urban Development Department Secretariat Building, Hyderabad. Telangana State.
2. The Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority, Rep. by its Metropolitan Commissioner (Director Planning-II), District Commercial Complex Tarnaka, Hyderabad, Telangana State.

**...RESPONDENTS**

**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 suspend the operation of Order dt.03/03/2025 in W.P. No. 18561 of 2017 on the file of this Hon'ble Court.

**Counsel for the Appellant: SRI D. JAGAN MOHAN REDDY**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.1: GP FOR MCPL ADMN URBAN DEV**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.2: SRI V. SIDDHARTHA GOUD, APPEARING  
FOR SRI V. NARASIMHA GOUD, SC FOR HMDA**

**The Court made the following: JUDGMENT**

**THE HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE SUJOY PAUL  
AND  
THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE RENUKA YARA**

**WRIT APPEAL No.323 of 2025**

**JUDGMENT** *(Per the Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice Sujoy Paul):*

Sri D.Jagan Mohan Reddy, learned counsel for the appellant and Sri V.Siddhartha Goud, learned counsel appearing for Sri V.Narasimha Goud, learned Standing Counsel for HMDA, for respondent No.2.

2. With the consent, finally heard.
3. In this intra-court appeal, the challenge is mounted to the order dated 03.03.2025, in W.P.No.18561 of 2017, passed by a learned Single Judge. By taking this Court to the operative portion of the impugned order, learned counsel for the appellant submits that the learned Single Judge has reproduced the contentions of the parties to some extent and thereafter in paragraph-(v), came to hold that the appellant has not challenged the letter dated 24.10.2016 and in absence of challenge to the said letter, consequential impugned letter dated 17.11.2016 cannot be interfered with.

4. It is strenuously contended by the learned counsel for the appellant that a plain reading of the said letter dated 24.10.2016 (page No.52) leaves no room for any doubt that it was an internal communication between two governmental authorities. The letter is not marked and supplied to the appellant. When the appellant was actually communicated with the letter dated 17.11.2016, he challenged it in the writ petition. Along with a memo, for the first time, the respondents filed the letter dated 24.10.2016 before the Writ Court. For appellant, there was no occasion to assail the letter dated 24.10.2016 when he filed the writ petition. However, in the fitness of things, the appellant may be permitted to assail the letter dated 24.10.2016 by amending the writ petition.

5. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for respondent No.2 opposed the prayer but did not dispute that the letter dated 24.10.2016 is, indeed, an internal communication between two authorities and was not marked to the appellant.

6. In this view of the matter and in the interest of justice, we deem it proper to set aside the impugned order dated 03.03.2025 and permit the appellant to file amendment application to challenge the letter dated 24.10.2016.

7. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 03.03.2025 in W.P.No.18561 of 2017 is **set aside** by giving aforesaid liberty to the appellant.

8. The writ appeal is accordingly **disposed of** without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case. No costs.

Interlocutory applications, if any pending, shall also stand closed

//TRUE COPY//

SD/-B.SATYAVATHI  
JOINT REGISTRAR

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Secretary Municipal Administration and Urban Development Department Secretariat Building, Hyderabad, The State of Telangana, Telangana State.
2. The Metropolitan Commissioner (Director Planning-II), The Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority, District Commercial Complex Tarnaka, Hyderabad, Telangana State.
3. One CC to Sri D. Jagan Mohan Reddy, Advocate [OPUC]
4. Two CCs to GP for Municipal Administration Urban Development, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT]
5. One CC to Sri V. Siddhartha Goud, SC for HMDA[OPUC]
6. Two CD Copies

TJ  
LS

PA

**HIGH COURT**

**DATED:17/03/2025**



**JUDGMENT**

**WA.No.323 of 2025**

**DISPOSING OF THE WRIT APPEAL**

**WITHOUT COSTS**

(9)

PA  
17/4/25