

High Court for the State of Telangana



e-Newsletter

Volume VII – Issue 4
(Oct 2025 to Dec 2025)



Editorial Board



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Chada Vijaya Bhaskar
Reddy**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
E.V. Venugopal**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Nagesh Bheemapaka**

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Sri T. Venkateswara Rao, Registrar (Protocol)-cum-(IT-HC).

Sri T. Sreenivas Reddy, Assistant Registrar.

COMPILED BY

Sri G. Samrat, Court Manager.

ASSISTED BY

Sri Ravi Tumu., Section Officer.

Ms. Gopika Menon, Asst. Librarian.



Foreword

In the last quarter of the year 2025, Telangana Judiciary has strived to achieve expedite justice and dispose of pending cases. In this regard, special Lok Adalat was held across Telangana on 15.11.2025 in which 74,782 cases were cleared. We also bid farewell to Honourable Sri Justice Abhinand Kumar Shavili, who retired on 07-10-2025. Honourable Sri Justice Abhinand Kumar Shavili began his career as an advocate before getting elevated as a Judge.

Telangana Governor, Jishnu Dev Varma presided over the 76th National Constitution Day celebrations held at Telangana High Court on 26.11.2025. The Hon'ble the Chief Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh, along with other dignitaries, was also present on the auspicious occasion. On this day, the honourable Chief Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh emphasized that the spirit of the Constitution must not remain confined to institutions or courtrooms; it must reach every person, every community and every household.

A sports tournament for officers and staff members of the High Court was organised for the first time on 15.11.2025. Honourable Sri Justice Sam Koshy inaugurated the tournament at the Gymkhana Ground in Secunderabad on Saturday. The sports events conducted include cricket, ball badminton and volleyball. Honourable Sri Justice B. Vijaysen Reddy, Chairman of the Sports Committee stressed that such sports tournaments should be conducted every year which will promote brotherhood among officers and staff members.

Honourable Sri Justice P Sam Koshy, Executive Chairman of the Telangana State Legal Services Authority and senior judge of the High Court is the first person from South India to be nominated to the Board of the National Legal Services Authority (NALSA).

Justice E.V. Venugopal

Contents

Hon'ble Judges of the High Court.....	5
Registrars of the High Court	9
Events of the High Court	10
Some of important Judgments delivered by the Hon'ble Judges of the High Court.....	13
Sanctioned strength, working strength and vacancy position of Hon'ble Judges of High Court for the State of Telangana as on 31.12.2025	77
Sanctioned strength, working strength and vacancy position of Judicial Officers in the State of Telangana as on 31.12.2025	79
Sanctioned strength, working strength and vacancy position of Ministerial Staff in District Courts as on 31.12.2025	82
District-wise Statement of Institutions, disposal and pendency of Cases from 01.10.2025 to 31.12.2025	84
Activities of Telangana State Legal Services Authority	85
Telangana State Judicial Academy - Important events	98
Inaugurations in District Courts	103

HON'BLE JUDGES OF THE HIGH COURT



HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE



**Sri Justice
Aparesh Kumar Singh**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
P. Sam Koshy**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Abhinand Kumar Shavili**



**Hon'ble Justice
Moushumi Bhattacharya**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
K. Lakshman**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
B. Vijaysen Reddy**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
N. Tukaramji**



**Hon'ble Smt. Justice
T. Madhavi Devi**



**Hon'ble Mrs. Justice
Surepalli Nanda**



**Hon'ble Smt. Justice
Juvvadi Sridevi**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Natcharaju Shravan
Kumar Venkat**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Chada Vijaya Bhaskar
Reddy**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
E.V. Venugopal**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Nagesh Bheemapaka**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Pulla Karthik**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
K.Sarath**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
J. Sreenivas Rao**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Namavarapu Rajeshwar
Rao**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Laxmi Narayana Alishetty**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Anil Kumar Jukanti**



**Hon'ble Smt. Justice
Sujana Kalasikam**



**Hon'ble Smt. Justice
Renuka Yara**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Narsing Rao
Nandikonda**



**Hon'ble Smt. Justice
Tirumala Devi Eada**



**Hon'ble Justice
B.R.Madhusudhan Rao**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Gouse Meera Mohiuddin**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Suddala Chalapathi Rao**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Vakiti Ramakrishna
Reddy**



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Gadi Praveen Kumar**



REGISTRARS OF THE HIGH COURT



Sri S. Goverdhan Reddy
Registrar (Vigilance)
FAC: Registrar General
reg.gen-tshc@aij.gov.in



Sri D. Ravindra Sharma
Registrar (Infrastructure)
FAC: Registrar (Enquiries)
reg.infra-tshc@aij.gov.in



Sri Sura Srinivas Reddy
Registrar (Administration)
FAC: Registrar (Recruitment)
reg.jud-tshc@aij.gov.in



Sri J. Jeevan Kumar
Registrar (Judicial-I)
reg.jud-tshc@aij.gov.in



Sri T. Venkateswara Rao
Registrar (Protocol)
reg.pro-tshc@aij.gov.in



Sri B.S. Chiranjeevi
Registrar (Judicial - II)
reg.jud2-tshc@aij.gov.in



Sri V. Ramesh
Registrar (O.S.D)
reg.mgt-tshc@aij.gov.in



Sri P. Sreedhar Rao
Registrar (O.S.D.)

EVENTS OF THE HIGH COURT



High Court for the State of Telangana launches sports meet to foster team spirit, physical fitness on 15.11.2025



The first-ever Sports Tournament–2025 was launched by Hon’ble the Chief Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh in the august presence of the Hon’ble Judges of the sports committee, aimed to foster team spirit, physical fitness among officers and staff of the High Court, at the Gymkhana Ground on 15.11.2025.

Hon’ble Sri Justice Sam Koshy, Hon’ble Sri Justice B. Vijaysen Reddy, Hon’ble Sri Justice Nagesh Bheemapaka, Hon’ble Sri Justice K. Sarath, Hon’ble Sri Justice J. Sreenivas Rao, Hon’ble Sri Justice Laxmi Narayana Alishetty, Hon’ble Sri Justice Narsing Rao Nandikonda, Judges of High Court for the State of Telangana and the Registrar General along with the other Registrars of the High Court have participated in the events. The tournament featured cricket, ball badminton and volleyball, drawing enthusiastic participation from employees.

While addressing the inaugural session, Hon’ble Sri Justice B. Vijaysen Reddy, Chairman of the sports committee, highlighted the importance of promoting sports within the institution and emphasised the need to conduct such tournaments annually to strengthen unity and brotherhood among the workforce.



The High Court for the State of Telangana celebrates
76th Constitution Day on 26.11. 2025



The High Court for the State of Telangana proudly commemorated the 76th Constitution Day in a solemn ceremony. The event was graced by the esteemed presence of His Excellency Sri Jishnu Dev Varma, Governor of Telangana and the Hon'ble the Chief Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh, all the Hon'ble Judges of High Court for the State of Telangana and Advocate General, A.Sudarshan Reddy, Additional Solicitor General of India, President of BAR Association of High Court for the State of Telangana, Senior advocates and other BAR members, have attended the ceremony.

During the event, His Excellency Sri Jishnu Dev Varma, Governor for the State of Telangana recalled Dr BR Ambedkar's reminder that the Constitution is not merely a lawyer's document, but a living instrument that must respond to the changing needs of society. "This living character has given us strength in difficult times,". Hon'ble the Chief Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh emphasized the importance of maintaining harmony among the different organs of the State to uphold democratic values and effective governance. Further, the dignitaries highlighted the need to promote constitutional awareness at the grassroots level, ensuring that citizens understand their rights and responsibilities under the law.



Farewell to the Hon'ble Judge of the High Court for the State of Telangana



Hon'ble Judges of the High Court for the State of Telangana bid farewell to Hon'ble Sri Justice Abhinand Kumar Shavili, Judge of the High Court for the State of Telangana, on the eve of His Lordship's retirement on 17.10.2025 A.N. on attaining the age of superannuation.



**Some of important Judgments delivered by the
Hon'ble Judges of this High Court**



**THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.M.MOHIUDDIN**

Acts/Rules: Article 226 of Constitution of India etc.

Case Details: Bumbathula Sravan Kumar and others Vs Telangana Public Service Commission in WRIT APPEAL Nos.18, 74, 106 and 167 of 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 31.12.2025 (*per the Hon'ble The Chief Justice Sri Aparesh Kumar Singh*)

Facts: It is the case of the petitioners that on the first day i.e., 01.07.2024, the medical examination was held in a very casual manner at Osmania General Hospital and the same was protested by some of the candidates, including the petitioner Nos.1, 3, 4, 5 and 8 and they sent mails to the Commission on 01.07. 2024, 02.07.2024, 03.07.2024 and 06.07.2024 objecting the manner in which the medical examination was conducted. Subsequently, some changes have been made in taking physical measurements. However, on the first day, no such procedure was adopted. On 10.10.2024, the Commission has published the provisional selection list, wherein the petitioners were not selected. It is stated that the petitioner No.7, who is working as the Transport Constable in Transport Department, which also requires the same physical measurements as that of AMVI. Similar is the case of the petitioner No.9, who is working as Forest Section Officer in Forest Department, which also require the same physical measurements. Thus, it is clear that the respondents have adopted illegal methods to disqualify the meritorious candidates like the petitioners. It is also the case of the writ petitioners that on the first day of medical examination, i.e., 01.07.2024, 50 candidates were asked to attend. Among those 50 candidates, 10 are female. Among those 10 female candidates, 6 of them are meritorious as per their marks in the written test, who could come with 1:1 ratio. However, out of those 6 female candidates, only one candidate was finally shown as fit and the remaining five meritorious female candidates, including petitioner Nos.1, 3 and 5 were shown unfit. Further, as per para 4 of G.O.Ms.No.147, the chest measurements shall be taken twice. But in the present case, the said procedure was not followed. As per the said G.O., the Board has to take the physical measurements, whereas in the present case, one single individual has undertaken the procedure. Therefore, the petitioners have filed the writ petition with the following prayer:



“... to call for the records pertaining to notification No.31/2022 dated 31.12.2022 issued for filling up the post of AMVI and declare the conduct of medical examination as unfair, unequal, uneven without standardized procedure that too by random persons without expertise, discriminatory and unconstitutional besides being violative of the procedure stated under G.O.Ms.No.147 and consequently direct the 1st respondent to undertake the re-medical by an independent agency/medical board and accordingly undertake the selection process only thereafter and to consider the candidature of the petitioners based on the re-medical examination coupled with their merit by issuance of Writ, Order or Direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus and pass such other order or orders as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case”.

The learned writ court framed two issues, which are extracted for the ready reference:

- “1) Whether the medical examination conducted by respondent No.5 was undertaken in a legal manner or on the basis of arbitrary procedure?*
- 2) Whether the re-medical examination sought for by the petitioners is permissible under the law?”*

The learned writ court observed that petitioner Nos.1, 3, 4, 5 and 8, who underwent medical examination on the first day of the schedule i.e., 01.07.2024, have sent e-mails to the Commission on 01.07.2024, 02.07.2024, 03.07.2024 and 06.07.2024 complaining the irregularities while conducting medical examination i.e., during chest measurements stating that they took measurement without giving sufficient time for proper inhalation and exhalation. Further, the women candidates have also raised objections before the Commission and also respondent No.5/Board members complaining that chest expansion for women was conducted in highly arbitrary manner. The writ court further observed that the counter affidavit filed by the Commission is silent on these allegations.

The learned writ court further noted that the petitioner Nos.7 and 9 are working as Government servants and the selection for the posts held by them also requires the very same physical standards, which are prescribed for the recruitment to the post of AMVIs and that the petitioner Nos.7 and 9 qualified in the medical examinations conducted in the years 2017 and 2019. The learned writ court expressed as to how they were disqualified in the medical examination conducted for the post of AMVIs in the present recruitment notification. The counter affidavits filed by the Commission and also the Board are silent on this aspect. In view of the aforesaid fact situation, the learned writ court came to the conclusion that the medical examination was not conducted in a proper manner in respect of petitioner Nos.1 to 5, 7, 8 and 9 and as such directed the respondents to undertake the exercise of re-medical examination in



respect of the petitioner Nos.1 to 5, 7, 8 and 9 and consider their candidature for selection to the posts of AMVI as per the outcome of the re-medical examination. However, insofar as the petitioner No.6 is concerned, who underwent medical examination on 03.07.2024, since she has not raised any objection/grievance before the Commission at the initial stage, the relief was not granted to her. The writ petition was allowed in part to the said extent. The writ court further directed the Government of Telangana to take steps for framing necessary norms in this regard.

Aggrieved by the said order of the learned writ court, respondent Nos. 12, 13, 6, 8 and 10 have filed W.A.No.18 of 2025; respondent No.14 has filed W.A.No.74 of 2025; petitioner No.6 has filed W.A.No.106 of 2025 and the Commission has filed W.A.No.167 of 2025.

Held: The learned writ court, while passing the impugned judgment, failed to take into account that any exercise of re-medical examination after 5-6 months would not be proper as the physical measurements especially of the chest of the petitioners could have undergone substantial change or improvement compared to the measurements recorded during medical examination between 01.07.2024 and 08.07.2024 at Osmania General Hospital.

As such, learned writ court was not justified in directing the Commission to undertake re-medical examination of petitioner Nos.1 to 5 and 7 to 9 for consideration of their candidature for the purpose of AMVIs. The petitioner No.7, Billam Teja Rao, who was BC-C category candidate, was found unfit in height as the minimum height requirement was 165 cms, whereas he was found to be 164.2 cms. The petitioner No.2, Aredla Mahidhar Reddy was found to be suffering from defect of vision as his right eye and left eye both were found to have 6/9 vision compared to the normal vision of 6/6. The petitioner No.9, Sravya Thalapally, a female candidate of BC-B category was found to have medically unfit in height. Rest of the petitioners were unfit as their expansion of full inspiration is less than 5 cms.

Learned writ court was persuaded by the statements of petitioner No.7, Billam Teja Rao, and petitioner No.9, Sravya Thallapally, that they fulfilled the physical standards in the years 2017 and 2019 at the time of their appointment as Transport Constable and Forest Section Officer respectively. The medical examination for the present recruitment was conducted in July, 2024 after 7 years and 5 years respectively, therefore, such comparison was not proper. Moreover, the measurement of height in the case of petitioner No.9 by a team of three professors of the Osmania General Hospital could not be doubted on that score. Petitioner No.9, if had genuine reasons to question the physical measurement of height by the team of three professor rank doctors of Osmania General Hospital, she ought to have raised her grievance at the



earliest point of time instead of waiting for the publication of final list after more than three months. The Certificate of Physical Fitness brought on record in support of her height is dated 14.10.2024 issued by a Civil Assistant Surgeon of the Osmania General Hospital. The same cannot be made a basis to suspect the Certificate of Physical Fitness, dated 06.07.2024, by the team of three professor rank doctors of the Osmania General Hospital. The conduct of the petitioners after having participated in the medical examination and waited till the publication of final list more than three months and thereafter turn around to question the method of selection, is not permissible. The learned writ court failed to take into account that G.O.Ms.No.147 dated 06.08.2016 issued by the Government of Andhra Pradesh does not have any application to the facts of the present case. The learned writ court was also not right in ignoring the proposition of law laid down by learned Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Pannala Praveen vs. State of Andhra Pradesh** [2017 (3) ALT 728 (DB)]. The learned Court had deprecated the constitution of the second medical board when the exercise undertaken by the Commission. Apart from the above, the learned writ court also failed to take into consideration that despite publication of the final list, the petitioners had failed to assail the appointment of the successful candidates, though several other successful candidates in the merit list were likely to be affected if the relief prayed for by them was allowed.

Coming to the case of the appellant in W.A.No.106 of 2025, her chest measurement on full inspiration was 68 cms, less than 79.80 cms prescribed on full inspiration for candidates belonging to the ST women category. If petitioner No.6 had any grievance thereto and had got her chest measurements taken at a Government General Hospital on 04.07.2024 showing chest measurement on full inspiration as 86 cms, neither did she approach the writ court immediately nor made any complaint like the other petitioners to the Commission. The measurements of chest would vary depending upon the fitness or health of a person. Therefore, the contention of the petitioner No.6/appellant in W.A.No.106 of 2025 that her chest measurement was commensurate to the requirements under the instant recruitment exercise, since her chest measurements in school was also of that standard is difficult to accept. We, therefore, do not find any reason to take a different view as respects the petitioner No.6/appellant in W.A.No.106 of 2025 for the reasons recorded hereinabove.

In the result, the impugned order dated 20.12.2024 passed in W.P.No.28639 of 2024 is set aside so far the learned writ court had directed the respondents to undertake the exercise of re-medical examination in respect of petitioner Nos.1 to 5 and 7 to 9 and to consider their candidature for selection to the post of AMVI as per the outcome of the re-medical examination. Writ appeal Nos.18, 74 and 167 of 2025 are allowed. Writ appeal No.106 of 2025 filed by the petitioner No.6 is dismissed.



THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NARSING RAO NANDIKONDA

Acts/Rules: Rule 10 of the Andhra Pradesh Goods and Service Tax Rules, 2017 etc.

Case Details: The Sales Tax Appellate Tribunal Vs M/S.Hyderabad Race Club in TAX REVISION CASE Nos :60,72, 105, 106, 116 & 139 OF 2010 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 13-11-2025 (*per the Hon'ble Sri Justice P.Sam Koshy*)

Facts: The facts of the case are that the respondent M/s. Hyderabad Race Club is an organization engaged in horse racing activities. During the assessment years in question, the Commercial Tax Officer examined various transactions undertaken by the club and determined that it qualified as a "dealer" under Section 2(e) of the APGST Act. The assessing authority found that the club was involved in multiple commercial activities including the sale of food items to outsiders (Rs.1,90,975/-), sale of oats to horse trainers (purchase value Rs.52,30,405/-), sale of gunnies (Rs.51,473), sale of tender forms (Rs.4,930/-), and sale of scrap materials (Rs. 1.29,100/-). Additionally, tax was levied under Section 64 of the APGST Act amounting to Rs.2,66,302/- on works contract turnover. The respondent challenged the tax assessment arguing that as a club it should not be treated as a dealer and that several of these transactions should either be exempted or taxed at different rates.

According to the respondent, the classification and taxation of oats formed the largest component of the contested turnover. The assessing authority had classified oats as "General Goods" under the seventh schedule and levied tax on the purchase value of Rs.52,30,405/-. The respondent stated that oats should be classified as "cattle feed" under Entry 80 of the First Schedule of the APGST Act, which would attract a lower tax rate of 4% (w.e.f. 01.04.1995) or 1% (up to 01.04.1995). The respondent submitted that the oats purchased were wild oats and not fit for human consumption and were exclusively used for feeding horses. Furthermore, the respondent maintained that even if taxable, the levy should be on the sale value of Rs.10,66,914/- (at which the oats were sold at subsidized rates to trainers) rather than on the purchase value, as Entry 80 stipulated taxation at the first point of sale.

The petitioner filed these Tax Revision Cases stating that the STAT has erred in its findings on two grounds:

a) Firstly, holding that the sale of tender forms is not eligible to tax, when such activity constitutes a business transaction that attracts tax liability under the APGST Act.



b) Secondly, treating oats as cattle feed under Entry 80 of the First Schedule at concessional rates, when it should be taxed as general goods at applicable rates.

Held: In the present case, oats fall squarely within the ambit of Schedule 1 of Entry 80, which explicitly provides for 'Poultry feed and cattle feed'. This entry is broad enough to encompass all forms of feed meant for livestock, including oats commonly used as nutritional feed for horses and other cattle. Conversely, Entry 20 of Third Schedule enumerates specific cereals such as Bajra, Kodon, Kutki, and Barley, and does not include oats within its purview. The absence of oats from this specific enumeration cannot be construed as an exclusion from the broader category of cattle feed under Entry 80 of First Schedule. The legislative intent behind these entries is to distinguish between cereals meant for human consumption or general commercial purposes and those which serve as cattle feed. Applying the principle of liberal interpretation, oats, when used as feed for horses and other livestock, must be classified under Entry 80 of First Schedule. This interpretation is consistent with the judicial approach that taxing entries should be construed in a manner that gives effect to their plain meaning and purpose, without imposing artificial restrictions that defeat the legislative objective.

Another aspect which comes in the mind of the Bench in the course of deliberation is that Entry 80 of First Schedule purely reflected "poultry feed and cattle feed" both had to be given a wide and exhaustive interpretation. More so for the reason that the said schedules stood amended vide Act No.27 of 1996, w.e.f. 01.08.1996, and in the process Entry 80A and Entry 80B were introduced. For ready reference, Entry 80A and Entry 80B are reproduced hereunder:

Sl.No	Description of Goods	Point of Levy	Rate of Tax
1.	2.	3.	4.
xxx	Xxx	xxx	xxx
80-A.	Feed supplements, nutrients Mineral Mixture, Vitamins, Medicines, and any other category of food supplements which are used in poultry feed, fish feed, prawn feed	At the point of first sale an State	8 paise in the rupee



	and feed for livestock		
80-B.	Fish feed and prawn feed for livestock other than cattle	At the point of first sale in State	4 paise in the rupee

A bare perusal of the aforesaid Entries would go to show that according to the law, as it existed prior to 01.01.2000, all those items which are reflected in the newly brought in Entry 80A and Entry 80B were all inclusive in the original Entry 80. This in other words also means that feed for livestock was not earlier there in any of the Schedules and therefore feed for livestock also would automatically have to be brought within the ambit of cattle feed. If feed for livestock was not part of cattle feed, the necessity of incorporating Entry 80A and Entry 80B was not necessary. This also means that if it had become necessary and hence it was segregated as a specific Entry, this itself forces; this Bench to also consider that it was earlier part of cattle feed itself.

For this reason also the arguments advanced by the learned Special Standing Counsel for Commercial Tax does not have any strong ground to stand.

For all the aforesaid reasons, the Tax Revision Case No.105 of 2010 filed by the State being devoid of merit deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed. Consequently, the other batch of Tax Revision Cases also stand dismissed.



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

Acts/Rules: Clause B(4) of the Special Conditions of Contract etc.

Case Details: M/s. Kan Enterprises Vs M/s. Kesari Marine Service in WRIT APPEAL No.1276 OF 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 04.12.2025
(*per Hon'ble Justice Moushumi Bhattacharya*)



Facts: A brief timeline of relevant events is required to be given for understanding the effect of the two rounds of litigation initiated by the writ petitioner/respondent No.1 herein.

- i. IOCL issued the LoA to the writ petitioner by email dated 20.02.2025. This was confirmed by an e-mail on 21.02.2025.
- ii. The writ petitioner wrote back to the IOCL on 03.03.2025 that it applied for clearance of its Barge from Kakinada Port.
- iii. IOCL issued the Work Order to the writ petitioner on 12.03.2025 for transporting white and black oil bunker supply to coastal and foreign run vessels stationed at Vizag Port through tanker Barges.
- iv. IOCL sent an e-mail on 21.02.2025 requesting to arrange initial deposit within 13 days of LoA dated 20.02.2025 and stating that the Barge had to be placed within 30 days from the LoA i.e., by 21.03.2025.
- v. IOCL once again sent another e-mail to the writ petitioner on 21.03.2025 stating that IOCL has to position the Barge within 30 days from the LoA i.e., by 21.03.2025 failing which the LoA would be liable for cancellation.
- vi. On 22.03.2025, the writ petitioner stated that it had resubmitted its application for clearance.
- vii. On 28.03.2025, the writ petitioner sent an e-mail informing IOCL that its Barge had arrived at Vizag Port.
- viii. On 29.03.2025, the writ petitioner sent an e-mail informing IOCL that the survey of its Barge at Vizag Port was completed.
- ix. On 01.04.2025, the writ petitioner updated IOCL about the status of the Barge. The e-mail sent by IOCL cancelling the LoA was also received by the writ petitioner.
- x. The writ petitioner filed W.P.No.15034 of 2025 on 07.05.2025 challenging IOCL's e-mail dated 01.04.2025 and 21.02.2025.
- xi. The Writ Petition was disposed of by an order dated 07.05.2025 directing IOCL to consider the grievance of the writ petitioner as stated in the writ petitioner's representation dated 01.04.2025 and reconsider the impugned decision by providing an opportunity of personal hearing to the writ petitioner and pass appropriate orders within a stipulated time frame. The Court restrained the respondents therein from taking coercive steps against the writ petitioner and its Barge till IOCL passed appropriate orders on the writ petitioner's representation.



xii. IOCL passed a Speaking Order on 06.06.2025 after giving a personal hearing to the writ petitioner. IOCL upheld cancellation of the LoA issued to the writ petitioner.

xiii. The writ petitioner filed W.P.No.16559 of 2025 on 01.07.2025 and obtained an interim order of status-quo from a learned Single Judge of this Court.

xiv. The interim order granted earlier was extended by a subsequent order dated 18.07.2025. The interim order was again extended on 06.08.2025 till 11.08.2025.

xv. IOCL issued the Work Order to the appellant on 18.08.2025.

xvi. The Writ Petition was finally disposed of by the impugned order on 07.11.2025.

Held: It is nobody's case that the tender process was not conducted in a transparent manner or in accordance with the Tender terms and conditions. The writ petitioner did not challenge the terms of the tender conditions including the condition of the Barge being made ready within 30 days of the LoA/Lol. Hence, the Speaking Order dated 06.06.2025 justifiably rejected the writ petitioner's objection as an afterthought. Most important, the writ petitioner proceeds on the basis of the Work Order being the starting point of the 30 days which is completely incongruous to the tender terms. The impugned order dated 07.11.2025 erroneously accepted the said condition, thus, importing a term in the tender document which was not there in the first place. The self-imposed limits of writ jurisdiction does not permit the Court to incorporate a new term in the tender document or to alter the terms in a manner suitable to only one party in the contract.

The above reasons persuade the Court to interfere with the impugned order. W.A.No.1276 of 2025, along with all connected applications, is accordingly allowed and disposed of by setting aside the order dated 07.11.2025 in W.P.No.16559 of 2025.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K. LAKSHMAN

Acts/Rules: Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, of Cr.P.C. etc.

Case Details: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Vs XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX in FAMILY COURT APPEAL NOs. 87 AND 100 OF 2015 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 01-12-2025



Facts: The appellant - wife filed both the appeals against the respondent - husband. FCA No.87 of 2015 is filed challenging the order dated 23.02.2015 in O.P.No.904 of 2008, whereas, FCA No.100 of 2015 is against the order dated 23.02.2015 in O.P.No.570 of 2008 passed by the learned Family Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B. Nagar.

The appellant – wife has filed an application vide O.P.No.570 of 2008 under Section 9 of the Act, 1955 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Act, 1955’) against the respondent - husband before the learned Judge, Family Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B. Nagar seeking restitution of conjugal rights. Vide impugned order, dated 23.02.2015, learned Family Court dismissed the said application.

Respondent – Husband has filed an application vide O.P. No.904 of 2008 under Section 13 (1)(ia) and (ib) of the Act, 1955 against the appellant - wife seeking dissolution of marriage on the ground of cruelty and desertion. Vide impugned order, dated 23.02.2015, learned Family Court allowed the said application granting decree of divorce.

Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied with the said orders, the appellant – wife filed the present appeals against the respondent - husband.

Held: During the course of hearing, it is brought to the notice of this Court that the parents of the respondent are no more. His brother impleaded in A.S.No.219 of 2015. It is pending. It is in respect of two mulgies situated at Bhimavaram, West Godavari District. However, learned counsel appearing for respondent, on instructions, submitted that apart from the aforesaid two mulgies, they have one more mulgi.

Though the appellant contended that the respondent is also holding 40 acres of land, she has not produced any document to prove the same. As discussed supra, it is not in dispute that the appellant brought up her daughter who is prosecuting MBBS Degree now. It is also her submission that the respondent did not pay the maintenance awarded by the learned Magistrate as modified by this Court. According to the respondent, he has paid the said amount. However, it is not proper to this Court to get into said controversy, in the present appeals.

Despite Ex.B.6 Award passed by permanent Lok Adalath, Eluru in Cr.No.134 of 2004 on the compromise by the appellant and respondent, they did not stay together and lead marital life happily. Disputes continued between them. Learned Family Court considered the said aspects in the impugned order and gave a finding that there was no trust, love and affection between the parties and there was no intention to cohabit with each other. With the said findings, vide impugned order dated 23.02.2015, learned Family Court granted decree of divorce. It is a reasoned order.



As discussed supra, appellant – Wife had filed a petition under Section 9 of the Act, vide O.P.No.570 of 2008 against respondent –husband seeking restitution of conjugal rights. Learned Family Court considering the aforesaid evidence both oral and documentary, vide order dated 23.02.2015 dismissed the said OP. Challenging the said order, wife preferred FCA No.100 of 2015.

In the light of the said discussion, we are of the considered view that there is no possibility of re-union of the parties. On consideration of the said aspects only, vide impugned order dated 23.02.2015, learned Family Court in O.P.No.904 of 2015 granted decree of divorce dissolving the marriage of the respondent – husband with the appellant - wife. Learned Family Court did not award any amount towards permanent alimony to the appellant - wife and also maintenance to their daughter. Therefore, we are of the considered view that the appellant – wife is entitled for an amount of Rs.50 Lakhs (Rupees Fifty Lakhs only) towards permanent alimony and also maintenance of her daughter.

In the light of the aforesaid discussion, the impugned order dated 23.02.2015 passed in O.P.No.904 of 2008 by the learned Judge, Family Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar, granting decree of divorce dissolving the marriage of the respondent – husband with the appellant – wife is confirmed, and F.C.A.No.87 of 2015 is disposed of directing the respondent – husband to pay an amount of Rs.50,00,000/- (Rupees Fifty Lakhs only) to the appellant – wife towards permanent alimony and maintenance of their daughter. He shall pay the said amount within three (3) months from today. The said amount includes the maintenance awarded by the learned Magistrate as modified by this Court in the aforesaid two applications filed by the appellant and their daughter under Section 125 of Cr.P.C. seeking maintenance. The said amount also includes the claim of the appellant and her daughter with regard to her interest in the property covered by the aforesaid gift settlement deed executed by father of the respondent in favour of the daughter of the appellant and the respondent in respect of two mulgies at Bhimavaram, subject matter of O.S.No.26 of 2012 and A.S.No.219 of 2015. The aforesaid amount of Rs.50,00,000/- (Rupees Fifty Lakhs only) is towards full and final settlement of the appellant and her daughter including permanent alimony and maintenance respectively. In view of the same, appellant and their daughter shall not make any further claim against the respondent over the properties of the respondent – husband in any manner etc. It is also made clear that if the respondent – husband fails to pay the said amount within the aforesaid period of three (3) months from today, liberty is granted to the appellant – wife and her daughter to take steps against her husband in accordance with law.

Thus, F.C.A.No.87 of 2015 is disposed of accordingly. FCA No.100 of 2015 is dismissed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B. VIJAYSEN REDDY

Acts/Rules: Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006; Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation Act, 1955 etc.

Case Details: Bipin Ramdas Ippakayal Vs The State of Telangana in WRIT PETITION No.39344 OF 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 22-12-2025.

Facts: The case of the petitioner is that Ms. Dr.Afzal Jabbar W/o. Dr. Md.Waliuddin, is the absolute owner of the property bearing Municipal No.11-5-422/3, admeasuring 720 square feet, situated at Red Hills, Hyderabad; she is presently residing in the U.S.A. and she has authorized her Special Power of Attorney (SPA) holder by name Mr. Osman Ali to manage and deal with the property. The SPA holder gave the property on lease to the petitioner under lease deed dated 15.10.2025 for running a restaurant in the property. Having taken the property on lease, the petitioner started renovation and interior fit-out works in the property. The petitioner obtained licence bearing TIN NO.0099-051-0053 from respondent No.3 and food safety licence bearing registration No.23625030006142 from the Food Safety and Standard Authority of India (FSSAI) as per the Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006.

Held: Be that as it may, the sale/ consumption of meat/non-vegetarian food within the precincts of temple may hurt the religious sentiments of devotees of the Hanuman temple. It is stated the Hanuman Temple had been in existence for more than hundred (100) years. It is commonly known that non-vegetarian food is completely banned within the precincts of a temple. Apart from the religious sentiments, it is also necessary to maintain serenity of the temple and hygiene in the temple surroundings. Further, the shop of the petitioner is stated to be situated on the road opposite to the Hanuman temple and at a distance less than 100 meters and there is possibility of traffic and law and order issues arising.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that business has not yet been commenced by the petitioner. Thus, alleging that the petitioner would commence business in non-vegetarian food is misplaced.

However, as per the photographs filed by the learned Standing Counsel for GHMC, live kitchen counter (popularly known as kabab centre) is already installed by the petitioner and the name of the establishment is 'NRI Live Kitchen' which, in all probability, can be used for cooking and selling meat/non-vegetarian food.

In the absence of any specific provision of law or rules, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of this writ petition with the following directions:



i) Respondents No.1 and 2 are directed to frame a policy for regulating the sale/consumption of meat/non-vegetarian food within a distance of 100 meters from the places of public worship or educational institutions or hospitals.

ii) Such policy/guidelines shall be framed keeping in view the religious sentiments of the devotees of concerned temple/place of worship, the people of particular faith, the serenity and hygiene, law and order and traffic issues.

iii) The policy/guidelines shall also include No Objection Certificate (NOC) for establishment of sale/consumption of meat/non-vegetarian food to be taken from the concerned Police Station so as to ensure that there are no law and order and traffic issues.



HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA

Acts/Rules: Constitution of India etc.

Case Details: Sri P.V.Amarender Reddy Vs The Principal Secretary, Higher Education and Others in WRIT PETITION No.18393 OF 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 04-12-2025

Facts: The petitioner's daughter, Pargi Shriya Reddy, studied at Alphores Girls Junior College, run by Respondents 4 and 5, during the academic years 2023–25, stayed in the college hostel, and completed her Intermediate education with 98% marks. The petitioner had paid all fees for both years, including tuition, books, dresses, and other charges, along with a refundable caution deposit. Despite full payment, Respondents 4 and 5 allegedly demanded an additional ₹75,000 for issuing the Long Memo, Bonafide Certificate, and Transfer Certificate, and sent an undated, unsigned handwritten demand through registered post. As the petitioner's daughter requires these documents to participate in ongoing counseling and admission processes for higher education, the petitioner informed the authorities that the demand was illegal and submitted a complaint to the Board of Intermediate and the Higher Education Department. The conduct of Respondents 4 and 5 in withholding the certificates despite full payment, and the inaction of Respondents 1, 2, and 3, violates the fundamental rights of the petitioner's daughter under Articles 14, 19, 21, and 21-A of the Constitution of India, thereby risking the loss of an academic year. Aggrieved by these actions, the petitioner filed the present writ petition.



Held: This Court opines that the 5th respondent cannot withhold the petitioners' original certificate, i.e., consolidated marks memo(Long Memo) under any pretext. There is no lien on the certificate of the students since the certificate of the student is his/her property. This Court opines that the right of students to obtain their Certificates from one institution to join another institution cannot be denied by the concerned authorities merely because the tuition fee is due and if any amount is due from the petitioners towards such fees, the proper course available to the respondents is to initiate appropriate proceedings against the petitioners for recovery before the competent Court and coercive tactics cannot be adopted by the 5th respondent to make the petitioners pay the tuition fee. This Court opines that there is no justification on the part of the 5th respondent in withholding the consolidated marks memo(Long Memo) of the petitioner's daughter for non-payment of tuition fee. Therefore, duly taking into consideration the view of the various High Courts on the subject issue in various Judgments, referred to and extracted above, this Court opines that petitioner is entitled for grant of relief as prayed for in the present writ petition.

Taking into consideration : (a) The aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case,

(b) The observations on the subject issue pertaining to withholding of original certificates of the students, by the Authorities concerned in the Judgments of the various High Courts (referred to and extracted above),

(c) The orders of this Court dated 07.07.2025 passed in W.P.No.18393 of 2025 (referred to and extracted above),

The Writ Petition is allowed as prayed for. The 5th respondent is directed to issue original certificate of the petitioner's daughter i.e., Intermediate consolidated marks memo(Long Memo) to the petitioner's daughter herein by duly taking into consideration the observations in the various judgments (referred to and extracted above) within a period of one (01) week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.



HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI

Acts/Rules: Negotiable Instruments Act; Code of Criminal Procedure etc.

Case Details: L Ramesh Vs The State of Telangana in CRIMINAL PETITION No.847 of 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 05-12-2025.



Facts: The brief facts of the prosecution case are as follows:

A complaint was filed under Section 190 read with Section 200 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, (for short, “Cr.P.C.”), alleging the commission of offences under Sections 138 and 142 of the NI Act by the accused persons. The complaint was lodged by the respondent No.2 before the learned trial Court in respect of the alleged offences committed on 19.11.2020 and 08.01.2021. The gist of the private complaint is that the complainant and the accused had maintained acquaintance and association for more than 20 years. Owing to the said acquaintance, the complainant advanced certain amounts to members of the Lingamaneni family, namely L. Ramesh (the petitioner–accused No.2), LVS Rajasekhar, and their companies.

It is further alleged that the accused Nos.2 to 4 approached the complainant seeking funds for investment in real estate ventures and, in turn, promised to deliver certain properties to the complainant for the amounts received, with a further assurance that, in the event of their failure to deliver such properties, the amount would be repaid with interest at 18% per annum. A cheque bearing No.040421, dated 03.09.2013 for an amount of Rs.2.00 crores, drawn on Axis Bank, S.R. Nagar, Hyderabad, in favour of M/s Viswaroopi Energy Private Limited i.e. accused No.1, was issued and subsequently encashed through HDFC Bank, Benz Circle, Vijayawada. The complainant asserts that after waiting for nearly three years, she repeatedly approached the accused seeking repayment of the amount. Thereafter, the accused Nos.2 to 4 executed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated 24.06.2016, signed by the petitioner–accused No.2. Under the said MOU, all creditors of the accused and their companies were collectively described as “Party A,” and the debtors, including individuals and their companies, were described as “Party B.” The complainant was reflected as the fifth member of Party A, while the accused No.4 was shown as the first member of Party B, and the company was shown as the third member. The consolidated liability of Party B towards Party A was recorded as Rs.300.00 crores, out of which the complainant’s entitlement was Rs.2.00 crores. However, the terms of the MOU were not honoured.

It is further alleged that upon repeated demands made by the complainant, the accused Nos.2 to 4 expressed willingness to effect partial repayment, and the accused No.4 acting in the capacity of Director of the Company, issued a cheque for Rs.2.00 crores in April 2019 towards part discharge of the debt. The accused requested the complainant to await further instructions regarding the date of presentation of the cheque, assuring that she would be informed once funds were arranged. The complainant waited for approximately one and a half years and again sought confirmation for presentation of the cheque. It is stated that by the end of October 2020, the accused assured that he would intimate the complainant regarding the



presentation of the cheque and, in the event of failing to do so, she could present the cheque at any time during November 2020.

It is further alleged that as the complainant was unable to establish contact with the accused thereafter, she deposited the cheque in her bank on 23.11.2020. The cheque was returned unpaid on 24.11.2020 along with a cheque return memo bearing the endorsement “payment stopped by drawer.” Consequently, the complainant issued a statutory demand notice dated 19.12.2020 calling upon the accused to make payment of the cheque amount within 15 days. The notice was duly served on 23.12.2020. A reply notice dated 08.01.2021 was issued by the accused and received by the complainant on 10.01.2021. As the accused failed to make payment even thereafter, the complainant filed the present complaint alleging commission of the offence under Section 138 of the NI Act. Based on the said complaint, the case was taken cognizance of and numbered as S.T.C. NI No.346 of 2021.

Held: This Court is of the considered opinion that the essential ingredients required to constitute the offence under Section 138 of the NI Act are not made out against the petitioner-accused No.2. In that view of the matter, the impugned order dated 24.09.2024 passed in CRL.M.P.No.3717 of 2023 in S.T.C.NI.No.346 of 2021 is liable to be set aside and the same is set aside. Therefore, the continuation of criminal proceedings against the petitioner accused No.2, and subjecting him to the rigor of trial, would amount to an abuse of the process of law, and the same are liable to be quashed.

Accordingly, this Criminal Petition is allowed and the criminal proceedings against the petitioner-accused No.2 in S.T.C.NI.No.346 of 2021 on the file of the learned X Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Manoranjan Complex, Nampally, Hyderabad, are hereby quashed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. SHRAVAN KUMAR

Acts/Rules: A.P.(T.A.) Abolition of Inams Act, 1955 etc.

Case Details: Seri Narayana Reddy and 21 others Vs The Joint Collector-I, Ranga Reddy District at Khairtabad, Hyderabad and three others in WRIT PETITION No.9786 of 2007 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 23-12-2025.



Facts: Facts in brief as stated in this writ petition are that the petitioners claims to be owners and exclusive possessors of subject lands owned by their predecessors. The petitioner No. 8 is the legal heir of late Venkat Reddy who had two sons by name Sri S. Narayana Reddy and the petitioner No.8 hererein, one S. Ma1la Reddy, who died leaving behind him two sons by name Sri S. Srinivasa Reddy and Sri S. Raji Reddy i.e. the petitioner Nos.2 and 3 herein. The petitioner Nos'4 to 9 are the only legal heirs of late Chandra Reddy, who died leaving behind him his two sons late Venkat Reddy and late Dharma Reddy. Sri Venkat Reddy died leaving behind him Sri S. Narasimha Reddy, Sri S. Kista Reddy and Sri S. Penta Reddy i.e. the petitioner Nos.4 to 6 respectively. Sri Dharma Reddy died leaving behind him sons i.e., petitioner Nos.1,7 and 9. The petitioner Nos. 10 to 12 are the legal heirs of Sri Ram Reddy who had two sons namely Sri Ramchander Reddy, Sri Ram Reddy and Sri Anantha Reddy. Sri Ramchander Reddy died leaving behind him Sri Linga Reddy the petitioner No.10. The second son of Sri Ram Reddy died leaving behind him i.e., Sri Anji Reddy, the petitioner No'11 herein. The petitioner No.12 is son of Sri S' Malka Reddy and petitioner Nos. 13,14 and 15 are the sons of Sri S Adivi Reddy. All the petitioners claims to be owners and possessors of the schedule lands totally admeasuring AC.77.30 guntas and would submit that they were in possession and having enjoyment rights from their fore-fathers and their fathers. The petitioners submits that the schedule lands are patta lands but not temple inam lands and the names of late Sri Venkat Reddy, Sri Chandra Reddy and Sri Ram Reddy have been recorded as pattedars and cultivators in possession, in the revenue records particularly in the Khasra pahani for the year 1954-55, therefore, no enquiry as contemplated under Section 4 of the Act, 1955 can be conducted in respect of the schedule lands.

It is submitted that Balaji Venkateswara Swamy Devasthanam, Chevella has no right to claim any ORC in respect of the schedule lands and if at all the schedule lands have been accorded to the said Balaji Devasthanam, it was done behind the petitioners back and it is not binding on the petitioners. The petitioners further submits that they are entitled to be granted occupancy rights since the ancestors of petitioners were in possession of the schedule lands and a statutory right vested in them which cannot be taken away without conducting proper enquiry. It is further submitted that the Trustee of the said temple is trying to mislead on the basis of a Muntakhab and that Muntakhab is only a statement and cannot override the rights granted under the Record of Rights Act. It is submitted that as per Sethwar and Khasra pahani for the year 1954-55, the petitioners ancestors were original pattedars and possessors of the schedule lands and that the Management, Endowments Department issued a notification date 27.06.2003 for conducting public auction to lease the lands belonging to Sri Balaji Venkateswara Swamy Devasthanam situated at Chevella Village, Rangareddy District and fixed the date for conducting the auction lease as 16.07.2004 and the said notification was challenged by the petitioners by filing a writ petition



No.14272 of 2003 before the Hon'ble High Court at Hyderabad wherein this Court granted interim orders staying the auction and subsequently, the writ petition was disposed of on 16.01.2004. It is further submitted that during the pendency of a case before the respondent No.2 vide Case No.L/708/1999 filed under Section 4 of the Act, 1955 in which petitioners filed objection petition of 12.09 .2004, petitioners came to know about the ex-parte orders passed in Case No.L/708/1999 by respondent No.2 and immediately applied for certified copy on 13.09.2004. It is the specific case of the petitioners that the respondent No.2 had found that no 'objections' were received from the petitioners during the course of hearing while reserving the case for orders, though the petitioners have filed objection petition through their counsels in response to the notice issued in Form No.11 dated 22.03.1999 and the counsel of the petitioners appeared before the respondent No.2 as and when the matter was posted for hearing.

It is further submitted that inspite of filing objection petition, the respondent No.2 proceeded, simply ignoring the petitioners objection petition and without giving any opportunity of hearing, proceeded ex-parte by relying on a pahani for the year 1973-74 furnished by respondent No.3 and passed orders in favour of Sri Balaji Venkateswara Swamy Temple holding that the Balaji Temple is in possession and was recorded as pattedar vide pahani patrikas for the years 1954-55 and 1997-78 and that the revenue authorities erroneously entered the name of Sri Balaji Venkateswara Swamy Devasthalam in the revenue records for the year 1961. It is further submitted that the document filed by the petitioners clearly establish prima-facie and balance of convenience in their favour and for which reason petitioners have filed appeal before the respondent No. 1 to set-aside the orders of the respondent No.2 and also seeking orders staying the operation of the order in Proceedings No.L/708/1999 dated 12.05.2006 and appeal was called and inspite of the petitioners representing that the their counsel is on the way, without heeding to their representation in the absence of petitioners counsel, the case was posted for orders. Thereafter, petitioners counsel filed a memo enclosing copies of sethwar, pahanies for the year 1971-72, 1972-73, 1974-75, 1977-78, 1978-79 and meanwhile sought time for filing pahanies for the year 1970-71, 1973_74, 1976_77, 1979-80, and prayed to grant time to file pahanies, by reopening the appeal. It is further submitted that the petitioners counsel tried to get the certified copy of Munthakab from respondent No.4 as well as from A.P. State Archives and Research Institute, Tarnaka, Hyderabad and on verification it was notified that the Munthakab filed by the respondent No.4 and the copy of which the petitioners have obtained from the A. P. State Archives and Research Institute, Tarnaka, Hyderabad are different, which amounts to suppression of facts by the respondent No.4. It is further submitted that the Munthakab order issued from Office of Nizamath Atiyat Government of A.P. Hyderabad and on its translation, it was revealed that one Sainaappa Chari submitted' applications along with testimonials granted by desmukhs of Narkhoda for the years 1177 Fasli, 1158 Fasli and 1292 Fasli,



in respect of Inam lands mentioned in column No.6 (i.e., schedule lands) of Munthakab for issuance of mash on the name of temple Balaji, Chevella. After processing, as per rule it was ordered that Inam lands situated at village Malkapur admeasuring 80 acres 23 guntas of revenue cess of Rs.104.06 NP and village Kumrah admeasuring 35 guntas of revenue cess of Rs 15/- ale reinstated in the name of Temple Venkateswar Balaji, Chevella. It was brought to the notice of petitioners by their counsel that there was no prior lawful grant in the name of temple and only testimonials were based on which re-instatement was given which does not come under the preview of Atiyat Enquiries Act, 1952 and even as per the Khasra pahani for the year 1954-55, the petitioners grandfather had taken loan for a sum of Rs. 360/- from Co-operative Society, Anjuman Imdadi Naharmin & mortgaged lands in Sy.Nos. 24,25,33,31, 36,29,18' 11' 12' to' 13' 14' 24'2a'27' 15, 16, 22, 21, 1g, 20 and 17 and also obtained a sum of Rs.336/- from the same society in Sy'Nos'278' 274' 273' 238' 23L, 237, 238,230, 232, 233' 234 and 236 and all these facts gives a genuine doubt as to the grant being giverr to the Sri Balaji Venkateswara Swamy Devasthanam, Chevella.

It is further submitted that "that the sethwar copy available on records clearly shows that lands are mentioned as Munthakab lands which means Inam lands and I will attract the provision of Inam Abolition Act" however, there is no record in the Sethwar as to lands are Munthakab lands which conclusion arrived is very much against the documental evidence produced by the petitioners. The petitioners further submits that recording of the lands as endowment lands in the records itself is illegal, as it was done by suppressing the read facts and no opportunity of hearing was given to prove the case of the petitioners. Questioning the same, the present writ petition has been filed.

Held: It is pertinent to note that the petitioners predecessors have never challenged the Munthakab issued from the Office of Nizamath Atiyath, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad where a condition of grant was given for rendering service to the temple and final orders were passed re-instating the name of the temple i.e., Venkateshwara Balaji, Chevella vide proceedings dated 02.05.1958 and subsequently the name of the temple was included in the revenue records and continue. The predecessors of petitioners earlier and the petitioners at a later stage have not questioned the said proceedings' but, had only filed objections when the temple had made an application dated 31.05.1999 for grant of ORC in respect of the Inam lands held by the Balaji Temple. When the predecessors of the petitioners have not challenged the inclusion of the subject lands in the revenue records in the name of the temple, the petitioners at this point of time have no locus-standi to claim the subject lands.



It is seen that the petitioners are disputing the very title and possession of the subject property whereas ORC was issued under Section 4 A.P.(T.A.) Abolition of Inams Act, 1955 in favour of the temple, which is confirmed by the respondent No. 1 by order dated 22.09.2006, whereas both the petitioner and respondent No.4 are claiming rights over the subject property. As there are serious dispute with regard to the title and possession of the subject property, the petitioners ought to have approached the Endowments Tribunal as per the provisions of the Telangana Charitable and Hindu Religious Institutions and Endowments Act, 1987 for adjudicating their rights over the subject property and since there are disputed question of facts, the same cannot be decided in summary proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution of India as per the judgment of the Honble Apex Court in **Shubhas Jain V. Rajeshwari Shivam [2021 SCC OnLine SC 562]** and **Radha Krishar Industries V. State of Himachal Pradesh [(2021) 6 SCC 771]**.

Further, on a perusal of the material available on record, orders, and by virtue of the continuance of Muthakab issued by the Office of Nizamath Atiyath, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad which was carried out by the revenue department and the said fact was also entered into the revenue records, by virtue of the orders passed by the respondent No.2 wherein ORC was issued to the temple and the same has been confirmed by the respondent No.1, and later the subject lands are notified vide District Collector's Gazette dated 09.11.2022 as landed properties belonging to the temples/institutions, therefore, the impugned orders passed by respondent No.1 dated 22.09.2006 does not warrant any interference and no mandamus can be issued at this point of time.

For the foregoing reasons, the writ petition fails being devoid of merits, and is accordingly dismissed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE CHADA VIJAYA BHASKAR REDDY

Acts/Rules: Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 etc.

Case Details: Chakali Ramulamma Vs P.Suresh And 2 Others in MOTOR ACCIDENT CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS APPEAL No.597 of 2019 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 10-12-2025



Facts: The brief facts of the case are that on 30.11.2007, the deceased was travelling in an auto bearing No.AP-23-X-5075 from M.R.F. Factory to his house and at about 12:00 midnight, when the auto reached near IBIZA company limits of Sadasivpet, a lorry bearing No.AP-16-TU-5153 came from opposite direction at high speed, driven in a rash and negligent manner, and dashed the auto. As a result, three persons died on the spot; the deceased sustained grievous injuries and was shifted to Government Hospital, Sangareddy, where he succumbed to injuries while undergoing treatment. A case in Crime No.335 of 2007 was registered against the driver of the lorry for offences under Sections 304-A, 337 and 338 IPC. The claimant, mother of the deceased, filed the claim petition seeking compensation of Rs.3,00,000/-.

The Respondent No.1 denied the accident, negligence, age, avocation and income of the deceased. The Respondent No.2— Insurance Company denied the policy and the involvement of the lorry and contended that there was breach of policy conditions. Respondent No.3 remained ex parte. The Tribunal, on appreciation of oral and documentary evidence, held that the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the lorry driver, but fastened liability solely upon respondent No.3 on the ground that the driver did not possess a valid driving licence and accordingly awarded compensation of Rs.2,40,000/- with interest @ 7.5% per annum.

Held: Coming to the issue of liability, the Tribunal concluded that the driver of the offending lorry did not possess a valid and effective driving licence as on the date of the accident, and on that basis alone fastened the liability exclusively on respondent No.3, absolving the insurer. Once the policy admittedly covers third-party risk, the claimant's entitlement cannot be defeated by internal breaches between the insured and insurer. The deceased was a third party, and the claim arises out of statutory liability. In **Kusum Lata & Others v. Satbir & Others (AIR 2011 SC 12340)**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that even in cases of breach of licence conditions, the insurer must first satisfy the award and then recover the amount from the owner. Similarly, in the recent decision in **Rama Bai vs. M./s. Amit Minerals through Incharge Officer/ Competent Officer and another (2025 SCC Online SC 2067)**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court applied the doctrine of "pay and recover", holding that the insurer must satisfy the award at the first instance and thereafter recover the amount from the owner. In view of the settled position, the Tribunal erred in fastening absolute liability on the owner without extending recovery rights to the insurer. Accordingly, respondent No.2—Insurance Company shall pay the compensation at the first instance and shall thereafter is entitled to recover the amount from respondent No.3, the owner of the lorry, in accordance with law.

In the result, this appeal is allowed and the compensation awarded by the Tribunal is enhanced from Rs.2,40,000/- to Rs.7,32,000/-, with interest at 7.5% per annum from



the date of petition till the date of realization. The respondent No.2-insurer shall satisfy the award at the first instance and thereafter recover the amount from the respondent No.3. The appellant shall pay deficit court fee on the enhanced amount. The remaining terms and conditions of the Tribunal shall stand unaltered.



HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE E.V. VENUGOPAL

Acts/Rules: AP (TA) Abolition of Inam Act, 1955 etc.

Case Details: Syed Nazeer Ahmed Vs State of Telangana in WRIT PETITION NO. 10990 OF 2011 AND W.P.No.36401 OF 2024 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 09-12-2025

Facts: The case of the petitioners was that the petitioner's greatgrandfather was granted 60 acres of land by the Nizam State in Sy.No.9/1, located in Saroornagar Village. The petitioner's grandfather sold 45 acres of this land in 1968 to one P.V.Hanumantha Rao, keeping the remaining 15 acres for himself. Their grandfather was issued an Occupancy Rights Certificate for the 15 acres under the AP (TA) Abolition of Inam Act, 1955. Subsequently, the said Occupancy Rights Certificate was set aside by the Collector, R.R. District vide order dated 01.04.1988 on appeal and the order of the Collector, R.R. District. Cancelling the Occupancy Rights Certificate was challenged in W.P.No.7520/1988 and W.P.No.2449/1988 and the said Writ Petitions were disposed by order dated 31.12.1991 in W.P.No.2449/1988 directing the State to implement the order of Board of Revenue in B1/3034/73 dated 06.08.1974 in favour of the petitioners. It is further submitted that the State Government filed L.G.C.No.1/1988 on the file of the Special Court under Section 8 of A.P.L.G. (P) Act, 1982 in respect of Ac.60-00 in Sy.No.9/1, Saroornagar Village claiming it as Government land against their grandfather and another L.G.C.No.39/1988 was filed against others. L.G.C.No.1/1988 and L.G.C.No.39/1988 were allowed by the Common Judgment of Special Court under A.P.L.G.C. (P) Act by order dated 30.07.1992 declaring the land is Government land and all the persons claiming through them and all persons in possession are liable to be removed from the possession by giving two months time granted for vacating the subject land and handover to the State Government. In compliance with the above orders of the Special Court, under Land Grabbing, the possession of the subject land of Ac.60-00 gnts., in Sy.No.9/1 was taken over by the then Mandal Revenue Officer, Saroornagar Mandal under cover of Panchanama on 01.08.1992. Being aggrieved by the Common Judgment dated 30.07.1992 passed



L.G.C.No.1/1988, L.G.C.No.39/1988 and L.G.C.No.39/1988, several writ petitions were filed vide W.P.No.17015 of 1992, W.P.No.10074/1992, W.P.No.10075/1992 and W.P.No.10076/1992. The erstwhile High Court of A.P., by common judgment dated 18.09.1996 along with W.A.No.284/1992 filed by the State Government questioning the grant of Occupancy Rights Certificate, disposed of all the above matters by setting aside the Judgment of the Special Court in L.G.C.No.1/1988 and L.G.C.No.39/1988 with a categorical finding that the petitioners are not land grabbers and that the order will not bar the authorities from acquiring the land for public purpose. Against the orders of the Hon'ble High Court, the State Government preferred Appeal (Civil) No.8601-8605 of 1997 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dismissed the appeal on 14.10.2003.

It is further submitted that the Deputy Collector & Tahsildar, Saroornagar Mandal on the representation on 08.11.2007 as well as in pursuance of the orders of the Apex Court and instructions of the Collector, Ranga Reddy District in B/1689/2006 dated 15.11.2007, directed the Mandal Revenue Inspector and Mandal Surveyor of Saroornagar to handover the possession of the land to the L.Rs. of Late Ghulam Ahmed on 12.01.2008. The then M.R.O., Saroornagar symbolically on 12.01.2008 under cover of Panchanama handed over under two spells i.e. Ac.8-00 gts., of vacant land and Ac. 7-00 gnts., covered by compound walls and houses total measuring Ac.15-00 gnts., and the same was informed to the Registrar, Hon'ble Special Court, vide Lr.No.B/2219/2004 dated 12.07.2010.

It is further submitted that physical possession of the land was not handed over because on the representation of the L.Rs of P.V.Hanumantha Rao over the land to an extent of Ac.45 of land in Sy.No.9/1, Saroornagar Village and Mandal. R.R. District, they were allotted alternative land to an extent of Ac.35-00 in Sy.No.288 to 290 and 296 part situated at Budwel Village, R.R. District in the year 2009 but they refused it and filed Writ Petition No.10990 of 2011 seeking to allot alternative land in lieu of the land admeasuring Ac.45-00 gnts., in Sy.No.9/1 of Saroornagar Village and Mandal, R.R. District on the file of this Hon'ble High Court and the same is pending.

Further submitted that even though the various courts including the Apex Court, declared that the petitioners and their ancestors were absolute owners they were not allowed to enjoy the subject land by the State Government due to pendency of the cases. In the meanwhile third parties occupied the subject land and that the State Government listed the subject property in the prohibitory properties list i.e., as Government land in Section 22-A Register. As a consequence, the petitioners are not allowed to alienate the property. As such they filed Writ Petition No.9934/2023 on the file of this Hon'ble High Court and the same is pending. Petitioners further submitted



that on the representation of their G.P.A. Holder, the Special Grade Deputy Collector & Revenue Divisional Officer, Kandukur Division gave a report on 29.12.2023 to the District Collector, Ranga Reddy District stating that the subject land was in the occupation of the third parties and houses were constructed and it was still recorded as Government land and kept in prohibitory list and no transactions were possible. Hence the petitioners were deprived of enjoying their property at the fault of the State Government only. In spite of repeated requests and representations being made by the petitioners herein there is no positive action from the official respondents.

Hence the present writ petition seeking a direction to the official respondents to allot alternative land having equal value of the land in Ranga Reddy District in lieu of land admeasuring Ac.15.00 guntas in Sy.No.9/1, situated at Saroornagar Village and Mandal, Ranga Reddy District to the petitioners.

Held: As could be seen from the above factual pleadings, the sum and substance of the litigation was that the father of the petitioners in W.P.No.10990 of 2011 purchased the property from the original inamdars i.e. father of the petitioners in W.P.No.36401 of 2024. The father of the petitioners in W.P.No.36401 of 2024 sold Ac.45.00 to the father of the petitioners in W.P.No.10990 of 2011 and thereafter ORC has been granted by the RDO under law. Land Grabbing Court in L.G.C.No.1/1988 has declared that the petitioners are land grabbers and that the land in an extent of Ac.60-00 is Government land. The said order was challenged before the High Court and after hearing all the parties the High Court allowed the writ petitions and set aside the orders of the Special Court. The appeal filed by the Government in the Hon'ble Supreme Court was dismissed and the same attained finality. In the process, after the LGC Court declared the petitioners as the land grabbers, the official respondents had taken over the property in question which was subsequently encroached by encroachers and necessary pattas were also given to the encroachers and civic amenities like roads, electricity infrastructure was provided. After a prolonged litigation and after the petitioners being declared as title holders and not land grabbers by the High Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the petitioners in both the writ petitions became entitled for re-possession of the land in Sy.No.9/1, located in Saroornagar Village. As no action has been taken and as no land was available, the petitioners filed the above writ petitions for grant of alternative land.

Therefore, it is not in dispute that the petitioners in both the writ petitions are the title holders in respect of their respective holdings. So their rights are crystallized by virtue of the judgments of this Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In that view of the matter, the respondents are bound to allot the land to the petitioners by virtue of their entitlement since because of the lapse on the part of the official respondents the land



in the subject survey number was encroached by others. When the issue is seized by the competent courts, the official respondents are under lawful obligation to protect the property until the rights are crystallized.

The learned Government Pleader submitted that in an identical situation the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **The State of Tamil Nadu vs. Dr.Vasanthi Veerasekaran {Civil Appeal No.8626 of 2009 dated 01.7.2019}** held that State is not under compulsory obligation to allot or grant alternate land. It all depends upon the fact situation existing as on date.

However, at this juncture, the learned Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the official respondents would submit that no other land equivalent to that extent is available either in Hyderabad or in Ranga Reddy District to allocate to the petitioners. He would further submit that if it is agreeable to the petitioners some other land would be identified outside Hyderabad and Ranga Reddy districts and would be allocated to the petitioners.

The learned counsel for the petitioners in both the writ petitions accepted the proposal made by the learned Government Pleader and would seek to direct the official respondents to allocate some other land to the petitioners in lieu of non-availability of land either in Hyderabad or in Ranga Reddy, but it should be equivalent to the value of the extent of the land, which the petitioners are entitled to.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Vidya Devi vs. State of H.P [(2020) 2 SCC 569]** held as follows:

10.1. The Appellant was forcibly expropriated of her property in 1967, when the right to property was a fundamental right guaranteed by Article 31 in Part III of the Constitution. Article 31 guaranteed the right to private property, which could not be deprived without due process of law and upon just and fair compensation.

10.2. The right to property ceased to be a fundamental right by the Constitution (Forty Fourth Amendment) Act, 1978, however, it continued to be a human right in a welfare State, and a Constitutional right Under Article 300A of the Constitution. Article 300A provides that no person shall be deprived of his property save by authority of law. The State cannot dispossess a citizen of his property except in accordance with the procedure established by law. The obligation to pay compensation, though not expressly included in Article 300A, can be inferred in that Article.

10.4 In N. Padmamma v. S. Ramakrishna Reddy [(2008) 15 SCC 517], this Court held that:



21. If the right of property is a human right as also a constitutional right, the same cannot be taken away except in accordance with law. Article 300-A of the Constitution protects such right. The provisions of the Act seeking to divest such right, keeping in view of the provisions of Article 300-A of the Constitution of India, must be strictly construed.

* * *

In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the present case, the Respondent-State is directed to pay the compensation on the same terms as awarded by the Reference Court vide Order dated 07.07.2015 in Anakh Singh's case (i.e. Land Reference No. 1 of 2011 RBT No. 01/13) alongwith all statutory benefits including solatium, interest, etc. within a period of 8 weeks, treating it as a case of deemed acquisition. An Affidavit of compliance is directed to be filed by the State before this Court within 10 weeks.

In view of the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above case, without going into that aspect i.e. value of the land, in order to put a quietus to the litigation, this court deems it appropriate to direct the respondents to identify appropriate land with mutual consent, without any encumbrances in lieu of extent of the land belonging to the petitioners in view of the rights accrued on the petitioners and to ensure the right guaranteed under Article 300- A of the Constitution of India and accordingly take necessary steps in accordance with law for allocating the same to the petitioners and complete the entire exercise as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. In the absence of which, petitioners are entitled to the just compensation to be determined in terms of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, also known as the Land Acquisition Act, 2013 and accordingly the respondents shall take appropriate steps, in accordance with law.

With the above directions, both the writ petitions are allowed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAGESH BHEEMAPAKA

Acts/Rules: Transfer of Property Act etc.

Case Details: Jeevla Vs Smt.Jadav Nisha Bai in APPEAL SUIT No.1021 of 2013 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))



Date of Judgment: 07-10-2025

Facts: Brief facts of the case are that the plaintiff filed O.S.No.51 of 2010 before the trial Court, contending that she is the absolute owner and possessor of the agricultural dry land, to an extent of Ac.2-10 guntas, in Survey No., Dharmasagar, Kandi village, Sangareddy mandal; that in February 2004, due to her husband's serious health issues requiring frequent medical treatment, she was in urgent need of Rs. 3 lakhs, and she approached the defendant (her younger brother), for financial assistance and expressed willingness to mortgage the subject land as security; that the defendant agreed to arrange the loan through a third party, as he did not have the amount himself; that in February 2005, the defendant paid the plaintiff Rs. 20,000 in cash and asked her to sign a document which he claimed was a mortgage deed, and trusting her brother, the plaintiff signed the document and accompanied him to the Sub-Registrar's office for registration without verifying its contents; that the defendant retained the original document and never paid the remaining Rs. 2.8 lakhs, and despite repeated requests, he continued to make false promises and delays; that in 2009, the plaintiff discovered that the document she signed in 2005 was not a mortgage deed but a gift deed executed in favor of the defendant, obtained by fraud and misrepresentation while exploiting her financial vulnerability; that she immediately obtained a certified copy of the deed and executed a registered deed of cancellation in October 2009; that the defendant, however, has remained in illegal possession of the schedule land and refused to vacate despite several demands; and therefore the plaintiff filed the Suit seeking a declaration that the gift deed is void due to fraud, and hence prays for restoration of her ownership and possession of the property.

Held: It is to be noted that in **Smt. Dularia Devi vs. Janardhan Singh [AIR 1990 SC 1173]**, the plaintiff therein was an illiterate woman who put her thumb impression, and the document was a sale deed disguised as a gift. Whereas in the instant case, the plaintiff, by her own admission, signed the document. More importantly, the document was exactly what it purported to be: a Gift Settlement Deed. There was no misrepresentation as to the character of the document (a transfer document), only a belated allegation about its contents (Gift vs. Mortgage), which is not sufficient to void a registered document.

Further, the trial court inferred "undue influence" merely from the fact that the plaintiff was in financial difficulty and the defendant was her brother who promised to arrange a loan. It is to be noted that the allegation of "undue influence" requires proof of a dominant position being used to coerce the donor's will. A sibling relationship does not create a presumption of undue influence. The plaintiff was a married woman with children, and there is no evidence she was mentally infirm or completely dependent on the defendant, and therefore merely because the plaintiff sought



monetary help from the defendant does not make the plaintiff vulnerable and put the defendant in a dominant position to allege undue influence, and there is no “unconscionability” in the Ex.A1 transaction.

Further, the defendant's pleaded case—that he had supported the plaintiff's family for years, including medical expenses and housing— provides a logical explanation for the gift out of "love and affection," as recited in the Ex.A1-Deed itself. Further, the defendant produced compelling documentary evidence (Ex.B2 to B6) showing mutation of the land in his name in the revenue records immediately after the gift deed. The plaintiff produced no evidence to show she remained in possession after February 2005. This evidence strongly corroborates the defendant's claim that the gift was accompanied by delivery of possession.

Furthermore, the trial court dismissed Ex.B1 (receipt for Rs. 4,95,000/-) on the ground that it was not mentioned in the written statement. However, it is to be noted that there is no plausible evidence to disbelieve the bonafides of execution of Ex.A1 for the financial help and support extended by the defendant to the plaintiff over the course of medical illness of plaintiff's husband and also for constructing a house for her. Though DW2 and DW3 stated that the plaintiff didn't intend to sell the subject property, it is not their case that the Gift Deed Ex.A1 was fabricated or false.

It is to be noted that when it is the admitted fact by plaintiff, and defendant, and also DWs.2 and 3, that the defendant had immensely supported the plaintiff during medical condition of her husband, and even bore the last rites expenses and also helped in her settlement by constructing a house in Miyapur, and furthermore, the husband of the plaintiff is an attesor to Ex.A1, there cannot be an assumption of fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the defendant.

Furthermore, Ex.A1-Gift Deed is a legal document admittedly executed by the plaintiff in favour of the defendant in 2005 and ever since the defendant has been in possession of the subject property by way of mutation of his name in revenue records. And, it is only in 2009, the plaintiff sought cancellation of Ex.A1 alleging that the defendant played fraud by misrepresentation. At this juncture, it is relevant to note that once a document has been registered and delivery of possession occurred, such a document is irrevocable under Section 126 of the Transfer of Property Act, except under very specific conditions (e.g., mutual agreement, rescission as in a contract). The plaintiff's unilateral cancellation of the Gift Deed (Ex.A2) is legally not sustainable. The reason cited by the plaintiff stating that “disputes arose among family members” only after gift deed, is not a ground recognized by law for revoking a legally executed Gift Deed. Further, the plaintiff herself admitted in cross-examination that there were no major



disputes. Therefore, the unilateral cancellation by the plaintiff, is a nullity and cannot divest the defendant of the title already transferred to him.

Further, the trial Court placed undue emphasis on the defendant's failure to examine the second attesting witness. However, it is to be noted that the execution of a registered document is proved by the document itself, and the burden to impugn the document lies with the person challenging the document. Since the plaintiff failed to lead credible evidence to doubt the execution of Ex.A1-Gift Deed, the defendant was not obligated to go into the proof of attestation. And, when once the document Ex.A1 is legally executed before the competent authority by the respective parties, the executor of the document cannot unilaterally cancel the document.

The trial Court has shifted the legal burden of proof and bases its findings on conjectures and sympathy, and misapplication of legal principles, rather than on the available evidence. It is to be noted that the burden is, in fact, on the plaintiff, who seeks to set aside a registered deed, to prove her allegations of fraud, misrepresentation, or undue influence with clear evidence. The plaintiff has failed to discharge this burden. The trial Court cannot seek the defendant to prove non-existence of fraud or misrepresentation, as, such proof would amount to proof of a negative fact. A positive assertion may or may not be proved by a party making such assertion, but a negative fact cannot be proved by adducing positive evidence. In **Laxmibai vs. Bhagwantbuva** [(2013) 4 SCC 97] , the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that "a negative fact cannot be proved by adducing positive evidence". When the plaintiff alleged there is fraud or misrepresentation in executing the Ex.A1, it is on the plaintiff to prove such alleged fraud or misrepresentation; and the defendant cannot be burdened to prove the contrary.

The defendant, by way of Ex.A1 and possession for over four years since the date of execution of Ex.A1 in 2005, established a strong prima facie case for the transaction. In that view of the matter, the impugned Judgment and Decree dated 21.10.2013 passed by the trial Court in O.S.No.51 of 2010 is liable to be set aside.

Accordingly, the appeal is allowed, setting aside the impugned Judgment and Decree dated 21.10.2013 passed by the trial Court in O.S.No.51 of 2010.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE PULLA KARTHIK

Acts/Rules: Constitution of India etc.

Case Details: Polampelli Raju Vs The State of Telangana in WRIT PETITION No.27795 of 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 17-12-2025

Facts: This Writ Petition, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is filed seeking the following relief:

“...to issue an appropriate writ order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus by declaring that the sub-clauses para 12(iv) and (vi) by the Respondent No. 2 in notification vide RC No. 237/Rect/Admn-2/2025 dated 15.08.2025 are arbitrary and discriminatory, and violation of the rights of reserved category candidates under Article 14, 16, 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondent No. 2 to permit reserved category candidates to compete for open category post based on their merit, without insisting for 40% marks in each paper and to reserve category candidate to compete in OC vacancies notwithstanding their availing of reservation benefits in the interest of justice and pass...”

Held: Having regard to the submissions made by learned counsel for the respective parties, and on perusal of the record, this Court is of the view that the lis in the present writ petition pertains to the validity of Clauses 12 (iv) and (vi) of the Notification dated 15.08.2025, which deals with the minimum marks to be secured in order to qualify in respective reserved categories, in addition to the marks to be obtained, so as to compete in the Open/EWS categories. The clauses under challenge are extracted hereunder:

“12. SELECTION PROCEDURE / SCHEME

A) Written Examination:

Note:

iv) The minimum marks to be secured by Candidates in order to qualify in the written examination for each paper is 40% for Posts under OC including EWS; 35% for Posts reserved for BCs; and 30% for Posts reserved for SCs and STs / Orthopedically Handicapped. Qualifying in each of the Papers: Paper-I and Paper-II is an essential prerequisite for a Candidate to be considered for selection.

...



vi) Candidates who secured 40% and above in each Paper i.e. Paper-I and Paper-II only are eligible to be considered for selection for Posts under OC / EWS.”

From a bare reading of the above, it is clear that the respondents have restricted the reserved categories candidates to compete in the open category, by imposing the condition of securing more than 40% of marks in each paper, while prescribing the minimum qualifying marks for BCs and SC/ST/PH candidates are 35% and 30% respectively. In this connection, it is pertinent to refer to the Telangana State Prosecution Service Rules, 1992, issued under G.O.Ms.No.16, Home (Courts.A1) Department, dated 21.03.2023, and paragraph 9, pertaining to Rule 11 of the Telangana State Prosecution Service Rules, 1992, is extracted hereunder:

“9. For Rule (11), the following shall be substituted, namely:-

11. Method of Examination of Assistant Public Prosecutor:-

(a) Written Examination:- Candidates will be required to appear for a written examination in 2 papers (each of 3 hours duration). Both papers will be set in English Language only. The syllabus is given below.

Paper I:- Indian Constitution, Code of Criminal Procedure 1973 and Criminal Rules of Practice and Circular Orders, 1990, Indian Evidence Act, 1972, Indian Penal Code and Minor Acts-200 Questions – 200 Marks.

Paper II:- Descriptive Type from the above syllabus with emphasis on Pleadings and Drafting – 200 Marks.

NOTE

1) Paper I will be Objective in nature containing 200 questions. Candidates have to answer the questions on an OMR Answer sheets using Blue/Black Ball Point Pen Only by selecting the appropriate choice on the computer, if the test is conducted in web-mode.

2) Paper II will be descriptive in nature. Candidates have to answer the questions using Blue/Black Pen in the question cum answer booklet which will be supplied by the TSLPRB

3) Minimum marks to be secured by the Candidates in order to qualify in the written Examination is 40% for OCs, 35% for BCs and 30% for SCs / STs in each Paper.

4) For each question in Paper I, the candidate shall be awarded full marks assigned to the question, if he/she choose the correct answer. In case the



Candidate has not chosen any answer, the Candidate will be awarded zero mark for that question. In all other cases, 25% of the full marks shall be awarded as negative marks for that question.

5) Paper II shall be evaluated only those Candidates who qualify in the Paper I.

(b) The written examinations will be either Online or Offline (OMR based). The Chairman, Telangana State Level Police Recruitment Board, Hyderabad may take decision in this regard from time to time.

Paper-II:- (Descriptive Examination) Answer scripts shall be Scanned/digitalized and preserved for record.

(c) Final selection of the Candidates shall be made strictly based on the merit as obtained by them through their aggregate score in the Written Examination out of 400 marks (200 marks in Paper I and 200 marks in Paper II).

(Emphasis supplied)”

It is evident from the above Rule that the minimum qualifying marks prescribed in the Notification at Clause 12 (iv) falls in tune with the Prosecution Service Rules. Hence, the said condition of securing the minimum qualifying marks in their respective reservations is in accordance with Rule 11(a) Note-3 of the aforesaid Prosecution Service Rules, and therefore, interference with the said Clause is unwarranted.

From the above Rule 11(c), it is also clear that the final selection would be entirely based on the merit obtained by the candidates through their aggregate score in the written examination in both the papers, but there is no embargo for the reserved candidates to compete in the open category. However, in the instant case, as per Clause 12 (vi) of the Notification, the candidates shall secure 40% of marks in each paper so as to compete in the OC/EWS categories, which not only goes contrary to the Prosecution Service Rules, but also disentitles them from competing with others in open category, duly enforcing their right of reservation in their reserved categories.

In Vijay Goutam Dabbiru v. Hon’ble High Court of Judicature, Hyderabad for the State of Telangana and the State of A.P., and others [(2019 (1) ALD 132 (DB))], the Division Bench categorically held the following:

“17. It appears from the language employed in the proviso that the object of the proviso is to provide a relaxed eligibility criteria for candidates belonging to the reserved categories. The object does not seem to be to provide a relaxed



eligibility criteria only to those considered under the exclusive streams. In other words, the relaxed eligibility criteria is not restricted in its application only to those opting to take the reserved category route.

18. The law is well settled that the reserved category candidates are entitled to ride two horses by competing with others in the open category on their own merit and also by choosing to enforce the right of reservation. The proviso to Rule 6(4) is not framed in such a manner as to make the benefit of relaxed criteria available only to those who opt to take the reservation route. Keeping this in mind, we shall now take a look at the decisions relied upon by Mr. C.V. Mohan Reddy, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner.”

In the light of the foregoing discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that while Clause 12(iv) of the Notification dated 15.08.2025 is in tune with the Telangana Prosecution Service Rules, Clause 12(vi) of the Notification dated 15.08.2025 is contrary to the said Rules. Hence, it is unsustainable and liable to be set aside.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is partly allowed setting aside the impugned Clause 12(vi) of the Notification Rc.No.237/Rect/Admn2/2025 dated 15.08.2025, issued by respondent No.2, and the respondents are directed to permit the reserved category candidates to compete for open category post based on their merit, strictly in accordance with the Rules in force.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K. SARATH

Acts/Rules: Civil Procedure Code, 1908 etc.

Case Details: Kata Srinivas Goud Vs Gudem Mahipal Reddy in Interlocutory Application No.2 of 2025 In/and Election Petition No.16 of 2024 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 10-10-2025

Facts: The petitioner, who is the respondent No.1 in E.P.No.16 of 2024, filed this petition under Rule-11 of Order-VII read with Section 151 of CPC to reject the Election Petition.



Held: Recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Ajmera Shyam Vs. Kova Laxmi and others** [2025 SCC OnLine SC 1723] , with regard to non-disclosure of assets and misrepresentation of educational qualification, held as follows:

“9.10.6 Under the circumstances, once the people have spoken their mind by casting their votes through the ballot box and reposed their confidence in the elected candidate, whenever the issue of invalidating the people's mandate is raised before the court, the court must be very careful and circumspect.

A fine balance must be struck between holding free and fair election— which involves the fundamental right of voters to have information about the candidates— and maintaining the sanctity of the mandate of the voters upon the declaration of the result. After all, election result is the embodiment of the will of the people expressed through the exercise of the constitutional right of the people to vote.

The court, therefore, must keep in mind that declaring an election void solely for non-disclosure of assets, if it lacks substantiality, could undermine the validity of the popular mandate. To nullify the choice of the people on a minor technicality and insignificant non-disclosure of assets by the elected candidate, would have serious repercussions on the democratic process.

Thus, while the court plays a vital role in upholding the rule of law, utmost care must be taken to ensure that election results are not invalidated based on subjective interpretation and minor or technical irregularities that do not substantially impinge on the law, since unwarranted interference with the electoral process and overturning election results can erode public trust in democratic institutions.

9.10.7 Under such circumstances, nullifying the election result and overturning the people's verdict through cold, clinical legal analysis and tools should be avoided, unless the electoral process has been vitiated by gross irregularities that undermine electoral integrity. Courtroom interventions should only happen when there are clear and blatant violations of the law that threaten fairness, legality, and constitutional principles.

9.10.8 Minor procedural errors or purely technical objections of inconsequential nature thus, should not be allowed to override the mandate of the electorate. Courts must be careful not to become tools that undermine the popular mandate in the name of technical perfection. The will of the people, expressed through the election result, should be respected, unless it has been corrupted by fraudulent practices, in which case, the court should intervene without hesitation. A judicial victory based on technicalities rather than the electoral victory won in the electoral battlefield should be avoided,



unless the mandate and the integrity of the electoral process are compromised by fraud or corrupt practices.

11.1 Judicial intervention in election disputes concerning disclosure of information, as discussed above, was prompted by the quest for sanitizing the electoral process by eliminating polluting elements by making candidates' criminal antecedents public. Aiming to prevent criminals from participating in elections to maintain purity of the electoral process — essential for the proper functioning of parliamentary democracy — the court was compelled to exercise its extraordinary power to issue specific directions. Consequently, not only disclosure of criminal antecedents, but also related obligations to disclose assets, liabilities, and educational qualifications of election candidates became mandatory. The knowledge of the criminal antecedents, assets and educational qualifications of the candidates by voters certainly invigorates the electoral process, which is ensured by obligatory disclosure by the candidate. However, the Court has made a subtle distinction between non-disclosure of criminal antecedents and that of assets and educational qualifications. While disclosure of criminal antecedents in the electoral process was the most critical element to maintain the purity of the electoral process which has to be scrupulously adhered to, disclosure of assets and educational qualifications were considered as attending supplementary requirements to strengthen the electoral process, of which there will be certain scope for consideration as to whether it is of substantial or inconsequential nature.

In the light of the above, this disclosure requirement as far as assets and educational qualification is concerned, should not be unreasonably stretched to invalidate an otherwise validly declared election over minor technical non-compliances that are not of substantial character, and should not be the basis for nullification of the people's mandate”.

(Emphasis added)

The above Judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India squarely apply to the facts of the instant case. Mere allegation that the petitioner/respondent No.1 not disclosed his movable and immovable properties, difference in mentioning his educational qualifications without any substantive documents this Court cannot proceed further in the Election Petition as the same not constitute the cause of action for filing Election Petition and the same has to be rejected.

The Election Petition and the documents filed along with the Election Petition are bald and vague allegations without stating the material facts in support thereof as required



under Section 83 (i) (a) and 100 of the Act, 1951 and there is no triable issue with regard to the alleged malpractices basing on the averments and documents filed by the Election Petitioner in the instant case. In view of the same, the petition filed for rejection of Election Petition is maintainable.

In view of the above findings, the respondent No.1/Election Petitioner failed to set out grounds as contemplated under Section 100 and the requirements of Section 81 and 83 of the Act, 1951, the instant Interlocutory Petition filed by the petitioner/respondent No.1 is liable to be allowed and the Election Petition filed by the respondent No.1/Election Petitioner is liable to be rejected under Rule-11 of Order-VII of CPC.

Accordingly, the I.A.No.2 of 2025 in Election Petition No.16 of 2024 is allowed. Consequently, the Election Petition No.16 of 2024 filed by the respondent No.1/Election Petitioner is hereby rejected.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE J. SREENIVAS RAO

Acts/Rules: Constitution of India etc.

Case Details: Mohd. Ahteshamuddin , Asif And Others **Vs** The State Of Telangana. in CRIMINAL PETITION No.14109 of 2015 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 18-11-2025.

Facts: Respondent No.2 has filed a complaint on 22.02.2009 at about 14-10 hours, stating that he is the owner and sole developer of a residential property admeasuring 811 square yards, bearing Municipal Nos. 11-3-848 to 11-3-848/5, situated at Malleshpally, Hyderabad. The property consists of 25 flats, which had been sold over the past four years, and the purchasers were in peaceful possession. He further stated that he had engaged security staff from Shah Security Services and other maintenance personnel for the building's upkeep. Despite receiving the entire sale consideration, the land owner had filed a civil suit O.S. No. 665 of 2008 before the II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad, seeking an injunction that was not granted as the purchasers were already in possession. However, on the night of 22.02.2009 at about 12:30 a.m., petitioners, along with their associates assaulted the security guard Mr. Shekhar, confined him in a room, damaged the building, and attempted to trespass into the property. Based on this complaint, Crime No. 39 of 2009 under Sections 448, 427, 342, 323 read with Section 34 of the IPC has been registered. Based on the said complaint, the Investigating Officer after conducting detailed investigation filed



charge sheet and the same was taken cognizance and numbered as C.C. No.715 of 2015.

Held: In **State of Kerala vs. M.M.Manikantan Nair [(2001) 4 SCC 752]**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the Code of Criminal Procedure does not confer any power upon the High Court to review or alter its judgment or final order once it has been signed, except to correct a clerical or arithmetical error as provided under Section 362 of Cr.P.C. The Court emphasized that this prohibition is absolute and that no criminal Court can reopen or reconsider its own final order. In that case, the High Court, after having earlier rejected a petition for quashing criminal proceedings, subsequently reversed its own decision on the same issue, which the Supreme Court held to be an impermissible review contrary to the express bar contained in Section 362 Cr.P.C.

In **Hari Singh Mann vs. Harbhajan Singh Bajwa and others [(2001) 1 SCC 169]**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that Section 362 embodies the well-established doctrine that once a court has finally disposed of a matter, it becomes functus officio that is, it ceases to have jurisdiction over that case and cannot entertain a fresh prayer for the same relief unless the earlier order is set aside by a court of competent jurisdiction. The above decisions affirm that once a criminal court has signed its judgment or final order, it cannot review, modify, or recall it, except for correcting clerical or arithmetical mistakes, ensuring the finality of judicial decisions in criminal proceedings.

In **Vikram Bakshi v. R.P. Khosla [(2025 SCC OnLine SC 1783)]**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court reiterated that under Section 362 of Cr.P.C, 1973, a criminal court, including a Magistrate under Section 6 of Cr.P.C, 1973, has no authority to alter or review its judgment once it has been signed, except for the correction of a clerical or arithmetical error. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, however, clarified that this limitation does not prevent the rectification of a procedural or typographical mistake, which is a mechanical or inadvertent error committed by the court itself, not involving the court's reasoning or discretion, where the order as recorded does not truly reflect what was intended or supported by the record. Such correction does not amount to a review on merits but only ensures that the judicial record speaks the truth.

In the present case, the Magistrate, by oversight, closed proceedings against all the accused though the de-facto complainant had given no objection only for accused No. 3. This mistake was purely clerical and procedural mistake only and did not arise from the Court's reasoning or discretion, as the order went beyond what was intended or warranted by the record. Hence, this Court is of the considered view that the said mistake falls within the scope of a clerical or procedural error, which the Magistrate, being a criminal Court, was competent to rectify the same to in order to prevent



miscarriage of justice, and also the said mistake would cause prejudice to the parties and to uphold the principle that no party should suffer due to the mistake of the Court.

The judgments which are relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioners in **M.M. Manikantan Nair supra** and **Hari Singh Mann supra**, are not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the case, especially in view of the subsequent principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Vikram Bakshi supra**, it was specifically held that the provisions of Section 362 of Cr.P.C. does not prevent the rectification of a procedural or typographical mistake, which is a mechanical or inadvertent error committed by the Court itself, not involving the Court's reasoning or discretion where the order as recorded does not truly reflect what was intended or supported by the record. Such correction does not amount to a review on merits but only ensures that the judicial record speaks the truth.

For the foregoing reasons this Court does not find any grounds to quash the proceedings in C.C. No.715 of 2015 on the file of the XVI Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Hyderabad. However, taking into consideration of peculiar facts and circumstances of the case and also in view of the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Sukhdev Raj supra**, this Court is of the considered view that the learned Magistrate ought to have given opportunity much less reasonable opportunity to the petitioners before passing the order dated 03.12.2013 while condoning the delay in filing a final report by the Investigation Officer. Hence, the order dated 03.12.2013 passed by the learned Magistrate is liable to be set aside and accordingly set aside. The learned Magistrate is directed to decide the application i.e., S.R.No.61 of 2013 filed by the Investigating Officer seeking condonation of delay in filing the final report afresh after giving opportunity to the respective parties and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two (2) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Accordingly, the criminal petition is disposed of.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAMAVARAPU RAJESHWAR RAO

Acts/Rules: Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1991 etc.

Case Details: M. Madhusudhan Rao Vs State of Telanagana in WRIT PETITION No.23486 of 2024 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))



Date of Judgment: 09-10-2025.

Facts: (a) The petitioner was initially appointed as Reserve-Sub Inspector of Police in S.A.R.C.P.L. vide proceedings dated 29.08.1991 issued by the Special Inspector General of Police, APSP Battalions, A.P., Hyderabad and thereafter promoted as Reserve Inspector vide proceedings dated 19.10.2015 issued by the 2nd respondent and working as such till date. While so, the 3rd respondent initiated disciplinary proceedings against the petitioner and issued Charge Memo dated 09.06.2016 alleging that the petitioner contracted multiple marriages and got involved in criminal cases in connection with the said marriages and that while availing L.T.C. he had shown the name of one Smt.M.Renuka as his wife and at the time of submitting pension papers, he has nominated one Smt.Sumalatha as his wife. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner had earlier filed W.P.No.42696 of 2016, and this Court granted an interim order. Later, the petitioner, believing that the respondents would drop the proceedings initiated against him, withdrew the said writ petition on 26.04.2021. Regarding two other charge memos, the writ petitions were withdrawn, and in those cases, the proceedings initiated against the petitioner were dropped.

(b) The petitioner's grievance in the present writ petition is that the disciplinary proceedings should not be continued on the same set of facts, since he has been acquitted in the criminal cases. A Statement of imputations of misconduct does not accompany the aforementioned charge memo, and the list of witnesses does not contain the names of witnesses, i.e., Mrs.Ganga Manohar, Smt.Jalaja Srinivasulu, Smt.Padmaja and Smt.Sumalatha respectively. Once the criminal cases are ended in acquittal, continuing the disciplinary proceedings on the very same set of facts would amount to double jeopardy.

(c) The petitioner was previously subjected to disciplinary/criminal proceedings based on a complaint filed by his former wife, Smt.Ganga Manohari and thereafter, he was removed from service vide proceedings dated 28.02.2001 issued by the Deputy Inspector General of Police, APSP, Hyderabad. However, the said proceedings were set aside by the Tribunal in O.A.No.1638 of 2001 dated 23.07.2001. Thereafter, the petitioner was reinstated into service vide proceedings dated 21.08.2001. Regarding the same allegations, the petitioner was tried for offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 420, 494, and 307 of the IPC. The petitioner was convicted for the offence punishable under Section 498-A of the IPC, but acquitted in respect of the other offences, as per the judgment, dated 14.02.2003. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has preferred Crl.A.No.259 of 2002, and this Court vide judgment dated 12.04.2006 set aside the conviction and sentence imposed by the court below. Subsequently, upon the directions issued by the 2nd respondent vide proceedings dated 26.06.2007, the petitioner was reinstated into service vide proceedings dated 01.05.2007 issued by the 5th respondent.



(d) After being dismissed from service in 2001, the petitioner got divorced from his wife, Smt.Ganga Manohari @ Renuka vide O.P.No.298 of 2002 dated 10.08.2002. Regarding the allegation concerning the petitioner's marriage and involvement in a criminal case, the issue is covered by the earlier orders of the Tribunal and this Court in the criminal case. Therefore, it is not open to the authorities to reopen the case after a lapse of more than 15 years from the date of the alleged incident and after nine years from the date of reinstatement into service.

(e) Regarding the allegation that the petitioner performed a third marriage with one Smt.Padmaja on 14.04.2006, it is stated that once the second marriage with Smt.Jalaja has not been proven in either the departmental or criminal proceedings, the allegation that the petitioner married one Smt.Padmaja is wholly erroneous and irrational. The petitioner's marriage with Smt.Padmaja took place on 14.04.2006, when the petitioner was under dismissal from service. The petitioner was dismissed from service on 25.02.2003 and was reinstated into service on 01.05.2007. The marriage was declared null and void by the Additional Family Court in O.P.No.447 of 2013, dated 09.07.2014. Regarding the same allegation, this Court quashed the criminal proceedings in Crl.P.No.2004 of 2013.

(f) Regarding the allegation that the petitioner initially furnished the name of Smt.Ganga Manohari @ Renuka for LTC, and later furnished the name of Smt.Sumalatha, at the time of submitting the pension papers, it is stated that at the time of availing LTC, the petitioner's marriage with to Smt.Ganga Manohari was subsisting and at the time of submission of pension papers, Smt.Sumalatha is his wife. Regarding the aforementioned incident, the petitioner was placed under suspension vide proceedings dated 01.07.2008 and later reinstated as per the proceedings of the 2nd respondent dated 08.10.2012. The proceedings against the petitioner were dropped on 28.05.2013, and the period of suspension was treated as on duty. Therefore, it is not open for the respondents to once again frame the very same charge and cause a second enquiry.

(g) In respect of Cr.No.189 of 2011, which was filed by the petitioner's present wife on 05.06.2011, it is stated that this court quashed the criminal proceedings, therefore, no criminal proceedings are pending against the petitioner in this regard. Thus, the petitioner has not violated Rule 25 of the Conduct Rules, which is to prevent bigamous marriages. The 3rd respondent, without considering the above facts, issued the impugned charge memo mechanically.

(h) The petitioner has submitted an explanation to the charge memo and requested the 3rd respondent to drop further proceedings. In this regard, the petitioner also represented through the proper channel to the 2nd respondent inter alia stating that since the petitioner was acquitted in criminal cases and proceedings were dropped, the 3rd respondent has no power to initiate proceedings against the petitioner. Without considering the petitioner's explanation, the 3rd respondent has



mechanically appointed the enquiry officer on 31.08.2016 to conduct enquiry. The very appointment of an enquiry officer is in gross violation of Rule 20 of APCS (CC&A) Rules, 1991. The 5th respondent, without considering the above facts, issued the impugned Memorandum, dated 19.08.2024. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

Held: As on today, all cases filed by both sides through criminal proceedings and divorce OPs., have been quashed, acquitted, and positive orders have been issued in favour of the petitioner on different dates. The petitioner obtained a divorce from Smt.Ganga Manohari @ Renuka on 09.04.2013. The Criminal Appeal was allowed on 20.04.2026, the marriage with Smt.Padmaja was declared as null and void on 09.07.2014 and the criminal petition filed by the petitioner was quashed on 09.04.2013 by the respective Courts. About Smt.Jalaja, there is no dispute between her and the petitioner.

The above facts clearly support the petitioner's contention that continuing the disciplinary proceedings on the same set of facts would amount to double jeopardy. Based on the above facts, knowingly and unknowingly, the respondent authorities issued proceedings against the petitioner, knowingly and unknowingly, pursuant to Memorandum P.R.No.51/2016/No.L&O/BS/Tr/1736/2- 13-16, dated 09.06.2016, and Memorandum No.HCP/NZ/HN1/OE/621/2021, dated 19.08.2024 issued by respondent Nos.3 and 5 are not sustainable and the same are liable to be set aside. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed by setting aside Memorandums dated 09.06.2016 and 19.08.2024 issued by respondent Nos.3 and 5 respectively.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE LAXMINARAYANA ALISHETTY

Acts/Rules: Land Acquisition Act, 1894 etc.

Case Details: Mohd. Mir Laiq Ali Vs The State of Telangana in WRIT PETITION No. 12081 of 2014 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 06-11-2025.

Facts: The case of the petitioner, briefly stated, as narrated in the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition, is that he is the owner and occupier of residential Plot



admeasuring 550 square yards bearing Nos.128 and 135, situated in Sy.No.192 (Masid Banda) of Kondapur Village, Serilingampalli Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, having purchased the same from one Kodicherla Mallesha under registered sale deed, dated 25.07.1991. While so, respondent No.3 issued a letter dated 01.06.2013, to the petitioner stating that in the proposed road widening from HCU Bus stop to Botanical gardens via Masjeed Banda, the plot of the petitioner to an extent of 112.8 square meters would be affected, for which, he would be given concessions as prescribed in GO.Ms.No.279, Municipal Administration, dated 01.04.2008. That the petitioner, having found that the concessions given as per the said GO are not beneficial to him, got issued a legal notice dated 05.07.2013 calling upon the respondents to follow the procedure contemplated under the L.A. Act for the purpose of acquiring his land said to be affected in road widening. But, as there was no response from the respondents, the petitioner again got issued another notice dated 13.01.2014, however, there was no response from the respondents. It is further averred that on 22.02.2014, the petitioner found some digging mark and cementing work in his land and therefore, he filed the present Writ Petition challenging the action of the respondents in encroaching his land without following due process of law.

Held: Section 146 of GHMC Act provides for acquisition of immovable property required for public purpose by agreement. The word 'agreement' denotes the express agreement between the Corporation, represented by the Commissioner, and the land owner/s thereof, with regard to acceptance of offer of TDR/FSI by the land owner/s concerned.

Section 147 of the GHMC Act envisages the procedure to be followed when immovable property cannot be acquired by agreement. The said Section postulates that whenever the Commissioner, representing the Corporation, is unable to acquire the immovable property by agreement with the land owner/s concerned, the same shall be acquired by following the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

For interpretation of Sections 146 and 147 of the GHMC Act, the language employed in the said provisions needs to be considered for knowing the legislative intent. The language employed in the aforesaid provisions is plain and unambiguous, in which case, the scope of legislation or the intention of the legislature cannot be enlarged or changed (See the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Bhavnagar University Vs. Palitana Sugar Mill (Petitioner) Ltd[(2003) 2 SCC 111]**).

In the case on hand, the respondent-Corporation proposed to acquired the land belonging to the petitioner by giving him the concessions as provided for in GO.Ms.No.279, MA, dated 01.04.2008, however, the petitioner declined to accept the offer of respondents-Corporation with regard to such concessions and called upon the



respondents-Corporation to follow the procedure contemplated under Land Acquisition Act, 1894, for acquiring the land belonging to him. Thus, there is no consensus between the respondent-Corporation and the petitioner-land owner for invoking Section 146 of GHMC Act. In other words, there is no express agreement between the petitioner and the respondent-Corporation, where under the petitioner accepted the offer made by the respondent-Corporation to extend the concessions as provided in GO.Ms.No.279, dated 01.04.2008. Thus, the two essential requirements, i.e., offer and acceptance, to constitute an agreement are not satisfied in the instant case, which empowers the respondent-Corporation to invoke Section 146 of the GHMC Act. 15. When a similar issue fell for consideration before a larger Bench of High Court of Bombay in **Shree Vinayak Builders and Developers, Nagpur Vs. State of Maharashtra and others [(2022) 5 AIR Bom R 803]**, it was held that the acquisition under Section 126(1)(a) of the Maharashtra Regional and Town Planning Act, 1966, has to be by consensus between both the parties and not only at the option of the Acquiring authority.

Section 146 of the GHMC Act is akin to Section 126(1) (a) of the Maharashtra Regional and Town Planning Act, 1966 and therefore, the ratio laid down in the aforesaid judgment squarely applies to the case on hand.

In the light of the foregoing reasons, discussion and the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Bhavnagar University's case** (cited supra) and the judgment of larger Bench of High Court of Bombay in **Shree Vinayak Builders and Developers, Nagpur's case** (cited supra), this Court is of the considered opinion that for invoking Section 146 of the GHMC Act, a consensus between the respondents-Corporation and petitioner-land owner is mandatory and it is not at the option of the acquiring authority alone. Therefore, the petitioner cannot be foisted upon to accept the concessions provided for in GOMs.No.279, dated 01.04.2008 and the respondent-Corporation has to necessarily follow the due procedure contemplated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, for acquiring the subject land belonging to the petitioner. Subject to the above, this Writ Petition is allowed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR JUKANTI

Acts/Rules: Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS')etc.

Case Details: Konda Vishweshwar Reddy Vs The State of Telangana in CRIMINAL PETITION No.8475 OF 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))



Date of Judgment: 27-11-2025.

Facts: On the basis of complaint of respondent No.2 (Machineella Ram Babu, Flying Squad In-charge Team No.1, Vikarabad), an FIR bearing No.69 of 2019 came to be registered on 12.03.2023 for the offences under Section 188 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'). It is stated in the complaint that respondent No.2, while performing his duties, at 11:00 hours, came across a hunger strike being undertaken in an open place opposite to RDO office, Vikarabad, by the followers of a national party. That petitioner/accused No.1 (MP Chevalla) along with other accused (accused No.2 - Ex-MLA Pargi, accused No.3 - MLA Tandur, accused No.4 - Ex-Minister, Vikarabad, and accused No.5 – Vikarabad Congress Party Town President) participated in the hunger strike. It is further stated that as per the Model Code of Conduct, they could not have conducted such meeting, without proper permission. Hence, the complaint.

Complaint is said to be received on 12.03.2019 at 14:00 hours, FIR came to be registered on the very same day. Charge sheet came to be filed against accused on 24.07.2019, on the file of Judicial First Class Magistrate, at Vikarabad.

On a perusal of the charge sheet, it is observed that contents of the charge sheet are a verbatim replica of complaint, except for the statement that the acts and commission of accused persons constitutes an offence under Section 188 of IPC and a reference to LWs.2 to 4.

Held:

Having considered the entire factual matrix of the case, this Court is of the opinion that interests of justice would be met, if proceedings in C.C.No.281 of 2022 on the file of the Special Judicial First Class Magistrate for trial of Excise Cases, Manoranjan Complex, Nampally, Hyderabad, against petitioner/accused No.1 are quashed, as the proceedings, if continued would amount to abuse of process of law.

This Court deems it appropriate that a copy of this judgment be marked to Director General of Police for the State of Telangana for taking necessary steps and to formulate a process for empowering public servants dealing with offence under Section 188 of IPC, as per the law laid down by the Apex Court.



HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE SUJANA KALASIKAM

Acts/Rules: Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 etc.

Case Details: Rajesh Agarwal Vs The State Telangana in CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.522 OF 2022 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 22.12.2025.

Facts: The facts of the case are that the 1stpetitioner was arrayed as A.14 in his individual capacity, as he was the Managing Director of 2nd petitioner-Company, which was arrayed as A.15 and represented by its Managing Director in C.C.No.28 of 2015. The petitioners alleged that based on a complaint given by the Zonal Manager of UCO Bank, Hyderabad to the DIG of Police, ACB, CBI, Hyderabad, a crime was registered in RC.15(A)/2013- CBI/Hyderabad. The CBI investigated the matter and filed a charge sheet against 15 accused attributing specific roles to each of them. The 1stpetitioner, Managing Director of M/s.ARSS Infrastructure Projects Limited, Bhubaneswar, and the 2ndpetitioner- M/s. ARSS Bhubaneswar represented by its Managing Director, entered into a criminal conspiracy with A.2, Managing Director of M/s.SSVG Engineering Projects Pvt. Ltd.- A.3 (for short 'SSVG'), to cheat UCO Bank, Banjara Hills Branch, Hyderabad. In pursuance of the conspiracy, A.2 obtained a fake Bank Guarantee for Rs.5 Crores in the name of A.15 Company. The 1st petitioner/A.14 dishonestly invoked the Bank Guarantee and fraudulently received Rs.5 Crores. The investigation revealed that the 2nd petitioner entered into a contract on 21.02.2009 with M/s. SSVG Hyderabad. In this connection, they submitted the Bank Guarantee format, a copy of Civil Contract Volume-1 between the Government of Odisha and Som Datt ARSS J.V. dated 03.11.2008, and other documents such as the Special Power of Attorney given by H.G. Advani dated 13.11.2008 in favour of S.P. Dash, the lawful attorney holder, and the Letter of Acceptance dated 27.09.2008. These documents were made available to M/s. SSVG, which in turn submitted them to UCO Bank, Banjara Hills Branch, Hyderabad. After receiving the Performance Bank Guarantee (PERFORMANCE BANK GUARANTEE) for Rs.5 Crores, M/s. ARSS Infrastructure Projects Limited, Bhubaneswar, and M/s. SSVG, Hyderabad, scrapped the sub-contract dated 10.03.2009 and entered into another sub-contract dated 09.04.2009.Under this contract, M/s. ARSS Infrastructure Projects Limited offered the work of widening and strengthening the existing carriageway to two lanes for Bhadrak–Chandbali part of package No. P02, from 0 to 45 km in SH-9 of the Government of Odisha worth Rs.100 Crores to M/s. SSVG, Hyderabad. The investigation further revealed that M/s. ARSS Bhubaneswar had not obtained permission from the employer, Government of Odisha, or from the Chief Engineer of the Project, SMEC International Pvt. Ltd. Thus, M/s. ARSS Bhubaneswar violated the special and general conditions of the main contract. The petitioners further stated that they were innocent of the offences



alleged against them and that a false case had been foisted. They argued that the allegation regarding the absence of a provision for mobilization advance was incorrect. From the contract agreements dated 21.02.2009 and 10.03.2009, there was a separate head titled "Mobilization Advance." In fact, the works contract entered into between the J.V. Company and the Government of Odisha contained Clause 14.2 under the heading "Advance Payment," which provided for mobilization funds. Therefore, the allegation that there was no provision for mobilization advance was false.

The petitioners further stated that the acts or defaults were those of the Contractor. Sub-contracting part of the work was permissible, and even the Odisha Government had not complained that the petitioners wrongly entered into a Subcontract Agreement in violation of the terms of the Contract. Not informing the employer about the name of registered Subcontractor did not attract penal consequences. Therefore, the petitioners argued that they could not be tried under criminal charges for such a violation.

The petitioners further stated that essence of the Subcontract Agreement dated 21.02.2009, which was placed before the Bank, clearly revealed that one of the terms was that the Sub-contractor had to issue a Performance Bank Guarantee of Rs.5 Crores in favour of A.15 Company. Hence, there was nothing suppressed in this regard. The petitioners submitted that they had no role or knowledge about any suppression of the third Agreement. The reason for executing the second Subcontract Agreement dated 10.03.2009 was that the conditions in the first Agreement were not fulfilled. For example, the 5% Bank Guarantee of the Contract value was not provided as agreed, and certain facts regarding the Work Agreement between the J.V. Partner and M/s. Som Dutt Builders were missing. They explained that expenditure clauses such as 8% royalty on gross bills and 3% survey/pre-tender expenses together amounted to 11% deductions. There was virtually no difference between the first and second Agreements, and hence no malafides could be attributed. It is also alleged that the third Sub-contract Agreement dated 09.04.2009 also did not differ materially from the earlier ones. Since the Sub-contractor failed to comply and the work was delayed, the petitioners themselves took up the work. At that stage, A.3 Company came forward with the requisite Performance Bank Guarantee and offered to execute the job. The petitioners accepted the Performance Bank Guarantee in line with the first Sub-contract Agreement and agreed to enter into a formal Agreement, as per the condition that a complete Agreement would be executed upon submission of the Performance Guarantee. The petitioners stated that Clause 4.2 of the Main Contract required the Main Contractor to provide Performance Security equal to 5% of the Contract amount. Accordingly, they advanced Rs.10.81 Crores to the Odisha Government by way of Performance Security vide Performance Bank Guarantee No.0665708BG0000328



dated 20.10.2008. Since the Sub-contract between A.3 and A.15 was worth Rs.100 Crores, the Performance Guarantee had to be extended by the Sub-contractor to the Main Contractor. Therefore, there was no violation of law.

The petitioners further stated that the Bank Guarantee was executed on 02.04.2009. As A.3 failed to commence work even after 9 months, the petitioners requested the Bank to invoke the Guarantee on 18.02.2010. The Guarantee was encashed on 09.03.2010. For over 11 months, the Sub-contractor failed to perform despite repeated telephonic discussions. A letter (D45) from the Sub-contractor to UCO Bank confirmed that deliberations regarding non-performance were ongoing. Hence, the allegation that the petitioners did not inform the Sub-contractor before invoking the Bank Guarantee was incorrect.

The petitioners referred to Clause 4.4 of the Contract Agreement, which allowed the Contractor to sub-contract part of the work but not the whole. The Contractor remained responsible for the acts or defaults of the Sub-contractor. They argued that if the Sub-contractor had started the work, they would have informed the employer. Sri Manoranjan Misra (LW15) stated that action could be taken against the J.V. and its partners for violations, but also confirmed that M/s. SSVG had not furnished any evidence. Since the Sub-contractor never mobilized men, machinery, or materials, there was nothing for the petitioners to report.

The petitioners stated that Rs.5 Crore Bank Guarantee offered by the Sub-contractor was en-cashed due to nonperformance. The petitioners then offered it to the Odisha Government, which also en-cashed it for non-performance. Therefore, no wrongful gain was caused to the petitioners. The petitioners argued that they had no intention to cheat from the beginning. They had already handed over a Bank Guarantee of Rs.10.81 Crores to Odisha Government on 20.10.2008. The State Bank of India also confirmed this by letter dated 20.07.2008.

The Performance Guarantee of A.3 was executed later on 02.04.2009. The Odisha Government eventually invoked the petitioners' Guarantee, causing them a loss of Rs.10.16 Crores. Since A.3 failed to perform, the petitioners themselves executed work worth Rs.42.60 Crores. The Contract was terminated due to A.3's non-performance, which caused huge losses to the petitioners. The petitioners finally submitted that they had nothing to do with UCO Bank. They were not customers of the Bank and had no transactions with it. If there were any illegal dealings between UCO Bank officials and A.3 officials, those were independent of the petitioners. Therefore, they prayed the trial Court to discharge them in C.C.No.28 of 2015.



The respondent therein filed counter stating that investigation established that 1st petitioner who is representing 2nd petitioner company entered into criminal conspiracy with other accused persons viz., Gundluri Srinivas, Managing Director of M/s. SSVG, Hyderabad to cheat UCO Bank, Banjara Hills Branch, Hyderabad and in furtherance of the said criminal conspiracy Gundluri Srinivas obtained Bank Guarantee for Rs.5 Crores in the name of 2nd petitioner Company and further 1st petitioner invoked the said Performance Bank Guarantee dishonestly and received a sum of Rs.5 Crores fraudulently. The respondent further submitted that the evidence collected in the form of document and statements revealed that 2nd petitioner Company was not competent to enter into Sub-contract with M/s. SSVG, Hyderabad as per the terms and conditions of the Main Contract entered with the Government of Odisha and knowing fully well that 2nd petitioner Company was not competent to enter into Sub-contract with M/s. SSVG, Hyderabad, 1st petitioner en-cashed the Bank Guarantee for Rs.5 Crores from UCO Bank fraudulently and caused undue loss to the Bank. The respondent further submitted that the above facts have clearly brought out strong prima-facie evidence, documentary and oral to prove that the petitioners and other accused persons had committed the offences as alleged in the charge sheet and that the bald statement of petitioners stating that there is no case, cannot be considered at this stage, as the same is the subject matter to be decided at the time of trial, as there is a prima-facie case made out with the material on record and hence, prayed the Court to dismiss the petition. After hearing the parties and the evidence on record, the trial Court dismissed the petition stating that the issue requires trial and there is prima-facie evidence against the petitioners for framing the charge. Aggrieved by the said order, the present revision case is filed.

Held: As per the main contract between the Government of Odisha and the joint venture, Som Datt Builders is the lead member. Neither Som Datt Builders nor ARSS informed the Government of Odisha or SMEC, the Project Engineer, about the engagement of SSVG as a subcontractor. ARSS engaged SSVG independently to complete the project on time as per World Bank specifications. ARSS provided SSVG with copies of the project specification volumes but did not share the main contract between the Government of Odisha and the joint venture for their review. The other witnesses have not stated anything against the petitioners herein. Though Lw.26 stated that ARSS has not intimated about the sub-contract, the letter submitted by the petitioners show that it was informed on 18.02.2010 to SSVG and after informing they terminated the contract. Further, the petitioners herein addressed letter to the UCO Bank stating that as the sub-contract is terminated they are invoking bank guarantee and the Bank accepted the same and after deducting the amount, they gave demand draft in favour of petitioners and the same was converted into loan. Further when the loan was declared as NPA they came to know that the property which are given as



security was already given as security to other bank and they were cheated which shows that whatever the action done by the petitioners herein are with the permission of Bank and Bank permitted them for invoking the bank guarantee and converted the bank guarantee into loan. As such, it cannot be said that petitioners herein have colluded with other accused and cheated the bank. Further, petitioners herein filed criminal case against SSVG and the same was registered in Odisha and NBW was also issued against A.1-G.Srinivas which shows that there is no collusion between petitioners and other accused and all the allegations are against SSVG. Though the said bank guarantee was converted into loan, the documents given as security by SSVG are false documents. Therefore petitioners cannot be held liable for the same and the submission of learned Standing Counsel is that there is no permission from Government of Odisha to subcontract to SSVG. If there is no permission, the Odisha Government has to take action against the petitioners herein for giving sub-contract to SSVG and it will not come in the way of invocation of bank guarantee. Viewed from any angle the allegation levelled against the petitioners herein that they have colluded with SSVG and cheated the Bank has no weightage. Therefore, the order of trial Court is liable to set aside.

Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is allowed setting aside the order dated 04.08.2022 in CrI.M.P.No.59 of 2022 in C.C.No.28 of 2015 on the file of III-Additional Special Judge for Trial of CBI Cases, Hyderabad and the petitioners herein are discharged from the above criminal case.



HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE RENUKA YARA

Acts/Rules: Civil Procedure Code, 1908 etc.

Case Details: Avirineni Jhansi Lakshmi and another Vs M/s. Vijayalakshmi 70 MM in CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.2456 OF 2024 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 23-10-2025

Facts: Initially, the respondent/plaintiff filed suit in O.S.No.652 of 2023 seeking perpetual injunction to restrain the petitioners herein from interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of suit schedule property i.e. land admeasuring Ac.0-12 Gts., in Sy.No.55, situated at Karmanghat Village, Saroornagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District bounded by North: Defendant's land, South: Neighbours house, East:



30 feet wide road, neighbours building and plaintiff's plot and West: Neighbours houses, without following due process of law. After filing of the said suit, the I.A under revision has been filed to reject the plaint for lack of cause of action. The case of the respondent is that there is no written agreement between the parties to the suit, no deposit or advance payment of any amount to the respondent, fixed amount of Rs.30,000/- is paid by the respondent to the petitioners every month from the year 2013 till August, 2023 without escalation and there is an alleged oral lease which is on month to month basis.

It is the case of the petitioners that the plaint is carefully drafted to create an illusion of cause of action which needs to be nipped in the bud at the earliest. Further, according to the petitioners, the respondent committed fraud on the Court by suppressing the fact that the suit in O.S.No.614 of 2023 was filed on 15.09.2023 on the file of the VI Additional Junior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar. Due to non-working days of Court on Saturday, Sunday and Vinayakachavithi, the matter was heard on 20.09.2023. When the respondent failed to secure ad-interim injunction from the VI Additional Junior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar on the first date of hearing on 20.09.2023, said suit i.e. O.S.No.614 of 2023 has been withdrawn on 21.09.2023. Immediately thereafter, the present suit i.e. O.S.No.652 of 2023 was filed with the same contents, same cause of action, same prayer including the typed content on suit valuation but before a District Court. The petitioners pleaded that the conduct of the respondent is highly objectionable as there is an abuse of process of the Court. It is further stated that the suit in O.S.No.614 of 2023 was withdrawn after first date of hearing i.e. 20.09.2023, on 21.09.2023 even before summons were served on the petitioners. The petitioners have withdrawn the license to respondent to park the vehicles in suit schedule property and in order to circumvent said withdrawal, the petitioner No.2 approached the Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Special (Mobile) PCR Act, Ranga Reddy District vide O.S.No.616 of 2023 and the matter was first heard on 10.10.2023. On that day, summons in the present suit were received by the petitioners and on enquiry, the objectionable acts of the respondent were discovered. Since the respondent approached the Court with unclean hands by blatant abuse of process of Court, the petitioners prayed that the plaint be rejected.

The respondent herein opposed the I.A denying the averments of the petition alleging that cause of action is mixed question of law and facts and until and unless the evidence is adduced by all the parties to the suit, the cause of action cannot be decided. As per counter affidavit in I.A.No.175 of 2023, there is an attempt of forcible dispossession. Withdrawal of a prior suit is not a ground to reject the plaint and suppression of said fact is ground for dismissal of the temporary injunction application but not rejection of plaint. It is admitted that the suit schedule property belongs to the



petitioners but the respondent is paying Rs.30,000/- per month on the basis of oral tenancy. There is an interference by the petitioners and therefore, the suit for perpetual injunction was filed. According to respondent, upon filing of O.S.No.614 of 2023, one of the mediator promised that he will get the matter settled only on withdrawal of the suit and basing on the assurance given by the mediator, the respondent herein has withdrawn the suit and when there was an attempt to dispossess the respondent, a fresh suit is filed. The respondent denied having license to use the property of the petitioners. The petitioner No.2 filed O.S.No.661 of 2023 against the respondent on the file of the Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Special (Mobile) PCR Act, Ranga Reddy District-cum-IV Addl. Junior Civil Judge for perpetual injunction alleging that he is in possession of the property and I.A.No.146 of 2023 is filed for grant of temporary injunction restraining the respondent from interfering with the alleged possession. Said application was dismissed on contest. Such allegations are of relevance in dismissal of an Interlocutory Application filed seeking temporary injunction but not rejection of plaint. As such, sought dismissal of the petition.

Held: In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that an illusory cause of action is by employing clever drafting for abusing the Court process for illegal gain. The fact situation clearly attracts the legal ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **T. Arivandandam v. T.V.Satyapal [(1977) 4 SCC 467]**, wherein, it is held as follows:

“5. We have not the slightest hesitation on condemning the petitioner for the gross abuse of the process of the court repeatedly and unrepentantly resorted to. From the statement of the facts found in the judgment of the High Court, it is perfectly plain that the suit now pending before the First Munsif's Court, Bangalore, is a flagrant misuse of the mercies of the law in receiving complaints. The learned Munsif must remember that if on a meaningful – not formal – reading of the plaint it is manifestly vexatious, and meritless, in the sense of not disclosing a clear right to sue, he should exercise his power under Order VII, Rule 11, C.P.C. taking care to see that the ground mentioned therein is fulfilled. And, if clever drafting has created the illusion of a cause of action, nip it in the bud at the first hearing by examining the party searchingly under Order X, C.P.C. An activist Judge is the answer to irresponsible law suits. The trial Courts would insist imperatively on examining the party at the first hearing so that bogus litigation can be shot down at the earliest stage. The Penal Code is also resourceful enough to meet such men, (Cr. XI) and must be triggered against them.”

To sum up, in the instant case, an illusory cause of action is created in September, 2023 when there was notice of termination of oral lease in June, 2023. Therefore, this Court



is of the considered opinion that the suit is liable to be rejected under Order 7, Rule 11 (a) of CPC for lack of cause of action. Next, there is an attempt at abuse of Court process for illegal gain. When a person approaches the Court with unclean hands, the said matter has to be thrown out at the same instance as per the legal ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***T. Arivandandam v. T.V.Satyapal [(1977) 4 SCC 467]***

In the result, the Civil Revision Petition is allowed setting aside the impugned order passed by the learned III Additional Junior Civil Judge at L.B. Nagar, Ranga Reddy District, in I.A.No.211 of 2023 in O.S.No.652 of 2023, dated 19.03.2024. Consequently, the I.A.No.211 of 2023 is allowed. The suit in O.S.No.652 of 2023 is rejected.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NARSING RAO NANDIKONDA

Acts/Rules: Indian Stamp Act, 1899 etc.

Case Details: Sri K.Kalyan Kumar Vs Sri G.Shivender Reddy and another in CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.3201 of 2017 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 17.12.2025.

Facts: The brief facts of the case are that Respondent No.1 herein is the plaintiff, who filed the suit against the revision petitioner and Respondent No.2 for specific performance of an Agreement of Sale, dated 06.07.1998 and for consequential relief of injunction.

While the matter was coming up for the evidence on behalf of respondent No.1/plaintiff, the petitioner/defendant No.2 filed an application under Section 33 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (for short, 'the Act, 1899') praying the trial Court to impound the Agreement of Sale dated 06.07.1998 and to direct respondent No.1/plaintiff to pay the deficit stamp duty and penalty of Rs.56,25,000/- on the said document.

It is further stated that the said Agreement of Sale is engrossed on 'Stamp Paper' worth Rs.100/- and there is a specific clause in the Agreement that possession has to be delivered as contemplated under Section 47-A (1) of the Act, 1899.



It is further contended that on 06.07.1998, the chargeable stamp duty is at the rate of 12.5% on sale consideration which would come to Rs.5,62,500/- and 10 times of thereof comes to Rs.56,25,000/-. In view of the same, as the agreement of sale is insufficiently stamped, it is liable for impounding.

Held: In the case on hand, the learned trial Court while rejecting the application has held that:

“The respondent No.1/plaintiff in his plaint contended that he is in possession of the suit schedule property, where as the petitioner/defendant No.2 contended that he is in possession of property who are in possession of the plaint schedule property i.e., respondent No.1 or petitioner will be decided after full fledged trial. Taking into consideration of the above facts and circumstances, I find that there is no need to send the agreement of sale for impounding of Stamp Duty and penalty. Accordingly, the point is answered. In the result, the petition is dismissed. No costs.”

As per Clause No.1 of the said Agreement of sale, defendant No.1 ought to have delivered the vacant peaceful possession of the suit schedule property to the plaintiff. In addition to the above, it is also specific pleading of the plaintiff in paragraph No.4 at page 3 of the plaint which is as under:

“As the defendant No.1 and her family members have good creditability and belongs to the respectable family, the plaintiff trusting her words and hence defendant No.1 and her husband E.Pradeep Reddy have delivered the peaceful physical possession of the suit plot on 05.05.1998 duly demarcating the boundaries in the presence and with the help of official of Jubilee Hills Housing Co-operative Society.”

Considering the above decisions of the Hon’ble Supreme Court and Division Bench of the High Court Of Karnataka, it can be culled out whenever the document is produced before the Court either at the time of registration of the suit or pending suit, once it is found that the said document is liable for payment of stamp duty or a deficit stamp duty has to be paid, in such case a duty is cast upon the Courts to exercise the powers under Section 33 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899.

It is also to be noted that where a situation arises when the party is avoiding the payment of the said stamp duty and penalty by contending that he may rely on it or not, but if it would result in loss of revenue to the exchequer, in such case, the trial Court, either at the time of filing of the suit or pending proceedings of the matter,



should exercise its power under Section 33 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 by sending the said document for impounding.

Hence for the said reasons, the Civil Revision Petition deserves to be and is accordingly allowed and the order passed by the learned XIV Additional Chief Judge (FTC) City Civil Court, Hyderabad, in I.A.No.733 of 2015 in O.S. No. 181 of 2009 is set aside. Consequently, I.A. No. 733 of 2015 is allowed, directing the learned trial Court to either collect the stamp duty and penalty or may send the document for impounding for collection of stamp duty and penalty in accordance with law.

As the matter is of the year 2009 and it appears that the entire trial has been concluded, the entire process of the impounding and collection of the stamp duty and penalty shall be concluded within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and if the same is sent for the collection and impounding of the document, the collector shall complete the process within one month from the date of the receipt of the document, failing which the parties may seek appropriate steps as contemplated under law.



HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE TIRUMALA DEVI EADA

Acts/Rules: Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 Etc.

Case Details: Ireddy Ravinder Reddy Vs The State of Telangana in CRIMINAL PETITION No.10573 of 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 08-10-2025.

Facts: This criminal petition is filed seeking to quash the proceedings dated 04.08.2025 in proceedings No.C/916/2025 by the respondent No.3-Revenue Divisional Officer/Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Siricilla.

Held: Conversely, in cases where the civil court has not made a determination regarding possession, the criminal court retains the authority to act under Section 145 Cr.P.C., as held by the Supreme Court in **Mando Kumhharuni v. Dutia Rana [(1990) 69 CLT 274]** . If there is no effective order from the Civil Court regarding possession or if the civil court has not determined which party is in actual possession, the Magistrate may proceed under Section 145 to maintain peace as per the decision in Mahant Govind Sharan Ji Maharaj v. State of U.P. If a Civil Court has issued an interim injunction



regarding possession, the Criminal Court should respect the order and may choose to drop the proceedings under Section 145 Cr.P.C.

In the present case, there is a direction by the High Court in Writ Petition No.10105 of 2022 to the effect of maintaining status quo with regard to the entries in Dharani Portal, which means to say that it has not ordered in favour of any of the parties. Further, the orders do not speak anything about the possession of either of the parties over the subject land. The impugned order passed by the RDO, Siricilla is to the effect that both the parties are prohibited in entering gathering and conducting meeting etc., in the said land until further orders and the Sub-Inspector of Police is directed to watch and maintain law and order at the disputed land. So, in order to maintain peace, the proceedings No.C/916/2025 dated 04.08.2025 under Section 145 Cr.P.C., are passed by the respondent No.3-Revenue Divisional Officer/Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Siricilla. Hence, the same need not be interfered with and are upheld.

In view of the law laid down by the Apex Court and the discussion held above, it is held that there is no infirmity in the impugned orders. Hence, the present petition lacks merit and the same is liable to be dismissed.



THE HON'BLE JUSTICE B.R.MADHUSUDHAN RAO

Acts/Rules: Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 etc.

Case Details: Maganti Ramana Kumar Vs Nimmagadda Annapurna in APPEAL SUIT NO.9 OF 2020 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 23-12-2025.

Facts: This Memorandum of Appeal is filed under Section 96 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (for short 'CPC') assailing the judgment and decree in OS.No.744 of 2007, dated 16.10.2019 passed by the II Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy at L.B. Nagar, Hyderabad.

Appellant is the defendant and respondent is the plaintiff in OS.No.744 of 2007. Respondent-plaintiff has filed suit to declare her as the absolute owner of the schedule property bearing Municipal No. 4-124/1 (Part), Old No.4-96/29, Plot No.46 in Survey Nos.331 to 334 admeasuring 269 square yards situated at Moosapet Village of Kukatpally Municipality.



Held: In **Prem Nath Khanna and Others Vs. Narinder Nath Kapoor (Dead) Through LRs and Others [AIR 2016 SC 1433]**, the point fell for consideration before the Supreme Court is “whether the plea taken by the deceased respondent No.1-defendant No.1 being in possession as a lessee could claim the alternate plea of adverse possession vice versa”. The Supreme Court held that respondent No.1 has no right to claim ownership over the suit property on the ground of adverse possession by taking a plea of sham transaction”.

In **Jai Kishan and Others Vs. Sardari Lal and Others [AIR 2015 Himachal Pradesh 93]**, the High Court of Himachal Pradesh held that “Plea of ownership and adverse possession are mutually inconsistent pleas, adverse possession cannot begin to operate until ownership is renounced”.

In **K.B. Bhandari Vs. Laxuman Limboo [AIR 2017 Sikkim 37]**, the High Court of Sikkim held that “Claim based on title and on adverse possession mutually inconsistent – The concept of adverse possession is in opposition to a claim under title, two claims cannot either be parallel or simultaneous”.

The decision cited by the respondent-plaintiff’s counsel in **Prem Nath Khanna and Others Vs. Narinder Nath Kapoor (Dead) Through LRs and Others [AIR 2016 SC 1433]**, **Jai Kishan and Others Vs. Sardari Lal and Others [AIR 2015 Himachal Pradesh 93]** and **K.B. Bhandari Vs. Laxuman Limboo [AIR 2017 Sikkim 37]** are squarely applicable to the case on hand.

The evidence of CW.1 is germane to decide the lis. The appellant-defendant has contended that he has paid an amount of Rs.27,000/- under Ex.B3 to CW.1. Exs.A1/A17 goes to show that CW.1 was having a registered GPA in his favour executed by Sunil D. Thakar vide GPA No.2213 of 1993, Book 4, Volume 215, Pages 481 to 484, dated 08.11.1993 registered at R.O., R.R. District. Exs.A16 and A18 are the Pass Books of the respondent-plaintiff which shows the amounts of deposits and withdrawal. Exs.A5 to A8 are the Property Tax Receipts from the years 2005 to 2008 with that of the receipts issued by GHMC under Ex.A9. The letter issued by Divisional Engineer, Electricity Department under Ex.A12 and Property Tax Receipts under Exs.A14 and A15 goes to show that after the execution of sale deed in favour of respondent-plaintiff under Exs.A1 and A17 property is mutated in her name. Furthermore, CW.1 has also stated that he has given letter to the concerned Department for mutation of the name, in pursuance of execution of Exs.A1/A17- sale deed. Ex.B5-Property Tax Receipt is after Ex.A6-Property Tax receipt dated 14.10.2005. The documents filed by the appellant-defendant are not much helpful to his case and the admission made by the appellant-defendant that he made the respondent-plaintiff as defendant No.1 in the suit filed by him for specific performance of contract which goes to show that he has knowledge



of Exs.A1 and A17 sale deed. Furthermore, he has not stated in Ex.A4-reply notice that the sale deed is executed in his name by the Court under Ex.B2 on 11.02.2006 except stating that he has a conveyance deed. Appellant-defendant has suppressed the material facts and he has not made out any case to interfere with the orders passed by the learned trial Court.

The learned trial Court has elaborately discussed the contentions raised by the parties and rightly decreed the suit holding that the respondent-plaintiff is the absolute owner of the suit schedule property and that she is entitled for delivery of possession and directed the appellant-defendant to vacate the same within 2 months from the date of judgment (16.10.2019) and further directed to pay Rs.4,000/- per month for 3 years prior to till the date of the suit.

This Court is of the view that the appellant-defendant has not made out any case to interfere with the orders passed by the learned trial Court, no interference is called for and the point is answered accordingly.

In view of the discussions above, Appeal deserves no consideration and the same is liable to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed.



THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.M. MOHIUDDIN

Acts/Rules: Central Goods and Services Tax Rules 2017, etc.

Case Details: M/s. BirlaNu Ltd Vs Union of India and 3 others in WRIT PETITION No.14564 of 2024 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 30-12-2025 (*per Hon'ble Sri Justice G.M. Mohiuddin*)

Facts: The petitioner M/s. BirlaNu Limited is registered as an Input Service Distributor (ISD) under the CGST Act. During the audit for the financial years 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, respondent Nos.2 to 4 observed that the petitioner had accumulated Input Tax Credit (ITC) during each Financial Year (for short, 'FY') and distributed the accumulated ITC in the last month (March 2018-2019) instead of distributing it month wise. This, according to the respondent authorities, is contrary to Rule 39(1)(a) of the CGST Rules, which mandates that the credit available for distribution in a month "shall be distributed in the same month". Consequently, a Spot Memo dated 07.12.2023 (Annexure-P5) was issued, followed by additional Spot Memo (Annexure-P7) and Final



Audit Report (Annexure-P11). A show-cause notice dated 30.01.2024 proposing a penalty of Rs.8,38,67,332/- (Annexure-P14) which according to the petitioner was issued without granting the petitioner adequate opportunity to respond.

Held: The Writ Petition is allowed with the following terms:

- i. Rule 39(1)(a) of the CGST Rules, 2017, to the extent it mandates that Input Tax Credit available for distribution in a month shall be distributed in the same month, is declared ultra vires Section 20 of the CGST Act, 2017, and is hereby struck down.
- ii. The Final Audit Report dated 22.01.2024 and the show cause notice dated 30.01.2024, along with all consequential proceedings are hereby quashed and set aside. Petitioner may claim refund of any amount deposited in connection with the impugned proceedings as per law.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUDDALA CHALAPATHI RAO

Acts/Rules: Article 21 of the Constitution of India; Article 226 of the Constitution of India etc.

Case Details: Union of India Vs Avula Somaiah in WRIT PETITION NO.32125 OF 2025
([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 27-10-2025.

(per Hon'ble Sri Justice Suddala Chalapathi Rao)

Facts: The applicant joined in the petitioners-organization as Postal Assistant on 15.07.1981 and got superannuated on 30.09.2022, after serving the Department for more than 40 years. As he was covered under the Central Government Health Scheme (CGHS) and was availing the CGHS facility as and when required. Further, on 03.04.2022 due to acute chest pain, applicant was admitted in the Star Hospital, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad in emergency and had undergone Heart Bypass Surgery i.e., "Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery" on 04.04.2022. After recovery from the said ailment, he was discharged from the said hospital on 08.04.2022 on payment of medical expenditure for Rs.4,36,700/-. Likewise the wife of the applicant was admitted in Yashoda Hospital, Secunderabad on 27.04.2022 due to acute headache in



emergency condition, she had undergone 'Endo Vascular Coiling of Right ICA (Ophthalmic Segment) Aneurysm' on 28.04.2022. She was discharged from the said hospital on 30.04.2022 on payment of Rs.5,04,400/-. As the applicant was entitled for reimbursement of the expenditure, he has filed application for reimbursement of the said amounts incurred by him towards the said operations conducted in emergency situation. That on 25.10.2022, the 3rd respondent informed the applicant that outpatient medical claims were sent to Khairatabad Head Office, for settlement at their end but, however, the said amounts were restricted from Rs.5,04,400/- to Rs.3,68,215.35 and Rs.4,36,700/- to Rs.2,75,127.68, and sent to the Regional Office for post facto approval. Further, when the applicant has approached the writ petitioners-organization for releasing the total amount expenditure incurred by him, the petitioners have informed him that his claim was settled in terms of 2014 rates. It is contended that as the applicant and his wife had taken treatment in the year 2022 in a emergency condition, applying the rates of 2014 under CGHS Scheme is unjustified. Further, it is contended by the applicant that he and his wife had to undergo operations only in an emergency condition, which was life-threatening and at that point of time that there was no other go, except to reach the appropriate nearest hospitals for medical attention. Further it is contended that though the applicant was entitled for the total reimbursement, petitioners have restricted the claim to lesser amounts by applying the 2014 rates and have not paid the total reimbursement despite the applicant meeting the eligibility criteria.

Held:

The Writ Petition is devoid of merits and is liable to be dismissed.

We deem it appropriate to formulate the guidelines for payment and reimbursement of the amount to the needy employees under the CGHS Scheme:-

- 1) In the case of emergency, the patient/employee shall have the choice for treatment in the nearest hospital and upon production of the proper bills and on verifying the genuineness, the authorities shall pay the total actual amount incurred by the employee.
- 2) The patient/employee need not require any prior permission if he gets treated in an non-CGHS hospital in the emergency condition subject to production of emergency certificate from the concerned hospitals.
- 3) The Department is at liberty to inspect the hospital and verify the genuineness of the claim of the employee in the circumstances of (1) and (2) and shall pay accordingly.
- 4) Only in the case of planned treatment, the Department may direct the employee need to take prior approval to get treatment in the non-CGHS hospital and only if the empanelled hospitals do not have the treatment plan for the ailments of the employee



or dependant or in the given situation where an expert Medical Surgeon or other medical professional services are essential.

5) The writ petitioner Department authorities shall revise the list of hospitals to be included under the CGHS Scheme every two years or as per the requirements of the employees or whenever the need arises in the consideration of the Department.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is hereby dismissed and the writ petitioner Department shall follow the above guidelines scrupulously.



THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ABHINAND KUMAR SHAVLI
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

Acts/Rules: Telangana Abolition of Inams Act, 1955 etc.

Case Details: Smt B. Lalitha Vs The Praga Tools Officers Co-operative Housing Society in Writ Appeal No. 1177 of 2024 and batch ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 07-10-2025 (*per the Hon'ble Sri Justice Vakiti Ramakrishna Reddy*)

Facts: The present batch of writ appeals comprises Writ Appeal Nos. 1177, 1169 and 1236 of 2024, and 171 of 2025, directed against the common order dated 29.01.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P. No.12030 of 2014 and batch, whereby proceedings initiated under the Telangana Abolition of Inams Act, 1955 (for short "the Inams Act") were examined and adjudicated.

For convenience of reference and effective adjudication, Writ Appeal No.1177 of 2024 is treated as the lead appeal, and the decision rendered therein shall govern the remaining connected writ appeals, as all of them arise out of the same common judgment, involve identical issues, and emanate from a shared factual and legal matrix. The writ appeals principally question the correctness of the common judgment of the learned Single Judge whereby the appellate order dated 01.02.2014 passed by the Joint Collector under Section 24 of the Inams Act was set aside, and the Occupancy Rights Certificate granted by proceedings dated 28.11.1979 was restored.

Held: The legal position that emerges is clear. The Telangana Abolition of Inams Act, 1955 is a self-contained and special statute governing the conferment of occupancy



rights in Inam lands, wherein actual possession as on 01.11.1973 constitutes the decisive and jurisdictional criterion.

The Telangana Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1950 operates in relation to Inam lands only to the limited extent contemplated by Section 33 of the Telangana Abolition of Inams Act, 1955 and cannot be pressed into service to override, dilute, or unsettle determinations lawfully made thereunder.

For the reasons aforesaid, we find no merit in the present batch of writ appeals. The order dated 29.01.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P. No.12030 of 2014 and the orders passed in connected writ petitions are in accordance with law and call for no interference. Accordingly, W.A.No.1177 of 2024 and connected batch of writ appeals are dismissed.



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

Acts/Rules: Consumer Protection Act, 1986, etc.

Case Details: M/s. Sreenilaya Chit Fund Pvt Ltd Vs The State of Telangana in WRIT PETITION No.32975 of 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 17.12.2025.
(*Per Hon'ble Sri Justice Gadi Praveen Kumar*)

Facts: The present Writ Petition is filed assailing the order dated 17.12.2024 in C.C.No.150 of 2024 passed by the learned District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission-III, Hyderabad (respondent No.2 herein) in allowing the complaint filed by respondent No.4 (subscriber of chit) herein in part directing the Opposite Party No.2 therein i.e. The Deputy Registrar of Chits to take necessary action against the Opposite Party No.1 therein i.e. petitioner herein and directing the petitioner herein to pay the bid amount of Rs.8,90,000/- to respondent No.4 with interest @ 12% p.a. from August, 2023 till the date of realization along with a sum of Rs.50,000/- towards compensation for the financial loss and mental agony caused besides Rs.5,000/- towards costs, within 45 days from the date of receipt of the order.

The facts leading to filing of C.C.No.150 of 2024 are that the petitioner herein, a Private Limited Company incorporated under The Companies Act, 1956, has been



doing chit fund business. Respondent No.4 herein, in order to meet her commercial requirements and needs, joined as a member of the Chit Fund Scheme of the petitioner, signed the Chit Agreement on 21.03.2020 and thereafter was allotted Ticket No.46 in the Chit Series of LT5N for a total chit value of Rs.10,00,000/- payable in 50 equal monthly installments @ Rs.20,000/- by 10th of every month.

It is the case of the respondent No.4 that she paid 13 installments for the period upto March, 2020 and participated in the auction conducted on 31.05.2020 and became successful bidder having agreed to forego a sum of Rs.4,00,000/- out of the total chit value of Rs.10,00,000/-. Thus, the petitioner is liable to pay a sum of Rs.6,00,000/- to respondent No.4 on furnishing sureties as per the terms and conditions of the Chit Agreement. Due to Covid Pandemic, respondent No.4 could not furnish sureties, and later in the month of July, 2020 she furnished required sureties to the satisfaction of the petitioner. But the petitioner postponed payment of the bid amount of Rs.6,00,000/- to respondent No.4 on one pretext or the other.

It is the further case of the respondent No.4 that in the month of March, 2021 the petitioner came forward to pay the bid amount of Rs.4,49,362/- after deducting the total subscription amount of Rs.1,50,638/- due from the 14th to 23rd installments i.e. from June, 2020 to March, 2021. Respondent No.4 claimed interest at the rate of 24% p.a. on the bid amount of Rs.6,00,000/- from the month of August, 2020 to March, 2021, for which, the petitioner refused to pay the same.

It is the case of the petitioner that respondent No.4 committed default in payment of amount towards installment Nos.48 to 50. Thereby the petitioner issued legal notice dated 03.03.2025 to respondent No.4 demanding for payment of defaulted amount together with interest @ 18% p.a.

It is the case of the petitioner that respondent No.4 filed complaint before respondent No.2 vide C.C.No.150 of 2024 against the petitioner claiming to pay the bid amount of Rs.8,90,000/- with interest @ 24% p.a. from August, 2023 till the date of payment.

Despite granting stipulated time by learned respondent No.2 to the petitioner for filing written version, as the petitioner failed to file the written arguments, respondent No.2 forfeited the right of petitioner to file its written version.

Learned respondent No.2 framed the following points for consideration:

- “1. Whether there is any unfair trade practice or deficiency of service on the part of the Opposite Parties as claimed under the complaint?
2. Whether the Complaint is entitled for the relief sought? If so, to what extent?”



During enquiry before the learned respondent No.2, on behalf of respondent No.4, P.W.1 was examined and Exs.A-1 to A-6 were marked. On behalf of the petitioner, no witnesses were examined nor were any documents marked.

Learned respondent No.2, based on the material available on record, vide its order dated 17.12.2024 held and reiterated that in spite of giving ample opportunity for the proper adjudication of the matter, the petitioner failed to appear before it, thereby petitioner's right to file written version and subsequent evidence affidavit and written arguments got forfeited. It was further held that the negligent attitude of the petitioner clearly proves unfair trade practice, techniques which resulted in financial loss to respondent No.4, thereby the petitioner has failed in fulfilling its obligations of paying the chit amount to respondent No.4 within the specified time and it amounts to deficiency in service. Learned respondent No.2 thereby allowed the complaint filed by respondent No.4 in part directing the petitioner to pay the bid amount of Rs.8,90,000/- to respondent No.4 with interest @ 12% p.a. from August, 2023 till date of realization besides a sum of Rs.50,000/- towards compensation for the financial loss and mental agony caused and Rs.5000/- towards costs.

Aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner has filed the present Writ Petition.

Held: In **Imperia Structures Limited Vs. Anil Patni and another [(2020) 10 SCC 78]**, the Apex Court held that the question as to whether the remedies available to the consumers under the provisions of the Act would be additional remedies, was considered in **Thirumugugan Coop. Agricultural Credit Society Vs. M.Lalitha [(2004) 1 SCC 305]** , **National Seeds Corpn. Ltd. Vs. M.Madhusudhan Reddy [(2012) 2 SCC 506]** and **Virender Jain Vs. Alakananda Coop. Group Housing Society Ltd.[(2013) 9 SCC 383]** . It was consistently held that the remedies available under the provisions of the 2019 Act are additional remedies over and above those under any special enactment and entertained the application under the 2019 Act. It was also held that Section 100 of the 2019 Act is akin to Section 3 of the Act and Section 107, the 2019 Act saves all actions taken or purported to have been taken under the previous Act of 1986.

Generally, the subscribers of the Chit mostly belong to Middle Income Groups, who invest their hard earned money in Chits for the purpose of future needs like education of their children, marriage, health or house construction etc.

In the present case on hand, admittedly the petitioner has failed to appear before the learned respondent No.2 in order to raise any issue with regard to maintainability and after abnormal delay, has approached this Court without availing the alternative



remedy, and the said course of action adopted by the petitioner shows that it is deliberately trying to delay the payment to respondent No.4.

On the other hand, the 2019 Act is a consumer friendly and beneficial legislation intended to address the grievances of the consumers. Moreover, the action of the petitioner having received the subscription amount, failed to pay the legitimate chit amount in favour of respondent No.4, cannot be sustained.

Therefore, we hold that the contentions raised by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner that the learned District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Hyderabad-III bars jurisdiction to entertain any dispute touching the Management of the Chit Fund business, cannot be accepted. On the other hand, any deficiency of service arose even under the Act is also maintainable before the learned respondent No.2 in view of the settled legal position of law.

Therefore, we do not find any reason to interfere with the order passed by the learned respondent No.2.

Accordingly, W.P. No. 32975 of 2025, with all connected applications, is dismissed.



**Sanctioned strength, working strength and vacancy position
of Hon'ble Judges of High Court for
the State of Telangana as on 31.12.2025**



Hon'ble Judges	Sanctioned Strength	Working Strength	Total Number of Vacancies
Permanent	32	20	12
Additional	10	8	2
Total	42	28	14

Note:

1. Hon'ble Sri Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh, the Chief Justice of the Tripura High Court, was transferred and appointed as the Chief Justice of the Telangana High Court. His Lordship assumed charge of the Telangana High Court on 19.06.2025 at 12:30 P.M.
2. Four (4) Hon'ble Judges from BAR have been appointed as Additional Judges of this High Court and assumed charge as such on 31.07.2025 at 10:00 A.M. (GMMJ, SCRJ, VRRJ AND GPKJ).
3. Transfer of Hon'ble Sri Justice T. Vinod Kumar, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana as Judge of Madras High Court and His Lordship assumed charge as such on 31.07.2025 at 10:30 A.M.



Statement of work done in the High Court as on 31.12.2025



NATURE OF CASES	PENDING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE MONTH I.E., AS ON 01.10.2025	INSTITUTIONS FROM 01.10.2025 TO 31.12.2025	DISPOSALS FROM 01.10.2025 TO 31.12.2025	PENDENCY
(A) ORIGINAL SIDE (CIVIL)	148392	12476	12906	147962
(B) APPELLATE SIDE (CIVIL)	53370	2897	2637	53630
(C) CRIMINAL SIDE	29816	5975	4552	31239

GRAND TOTAL:

GRAND TOTAL OF CIVIL CASES	201762	15373	15543	201592
GRAND TOTAL OF CRIMINAL CASES	29816	5675	4552	31239
GRAND TOTAL OF MAIN CASES	231578	21348	20095	232831



Sanctioned strength, working strength and vacancy position of Judicial Officers in the State of Telangana as on 31.12.2025



S.No	Cadre Strength	Sanctioned Strength	Total Number of Judicial Officers Working	Total Number of Vacancies
1.	District Judges	188	153	35
2.	Senior Civil Judges	155	96	59
3	Junior Civil Judges	276	232	44
TOTAL		619	481	138

DISTRICT JUDGE (ENTRY LEVEL) UNDER DIRECT RECRUITMENT FOR THE YEAR 2025:

The High Court for the State of Telangana has placed a notification on 24-03-2025 notifying Seventeen (17) vacancies in the cadre of District Judge (Entry Level) to be filled by direct recruitment (under 25% quota) for the year 2025. Further steps are taken to amend the Telangana State Judicial Service and Cadre Rules 2023 in terms of the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in certain IA.Nos.in W.P(C) No. 1022/1989 (All India Judges Association case), the Hon'ble High Court has received the amended rules.

Further certain Amendments in terms of the Judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No.3947/2020 are received and High court is proposing amendments to that effect as such the notification for 25% Quota for the year 2025 could not be issued.

DISTRICT JUDGE (ENTRY LEVEL) UNDER RECRUITMENT BY TRANSFER THROUGH LIMITED DEPARTMENTAL COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION FOR THE YEAR 2025:

The High Court for the State of Telangana has placed a notification on 24-03-2025 notifying Fourteen (14) vacancies in the cadre of District Judge (Entry Level) to be filled by transfer through Limited Competitive Examination (Accelerated Recruitment by Transfer) under 10% for the year 2025. Further steps are taken to amend the Telangana State Judicial Service and Cadre Rules 2023, in terms of the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in certain IA.Nos.in W.P(C) No.



1022/1989(All India Judges Association case), in this connection the Hon'ble High Court has received the amended rules.

Further certain Amendments in terms of the Judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No.3947/2020 are recieved and High court is proposing amendments to that effect as such the notification for 10% Quota for the year 2025 could not be issued.

CIVIL JUDGES (JUNIOR DIVISION) – 2025

As per orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in W.P.(C) No. 1022/1989 the High Court for the State of Telangana has proposed amendments to the Telangana State Judicial (Service and Cadre) Rules 2023, that the Govt of Telangana have approved the proposal and issued G.O. amending the Rules. In accordance with the amended Rules, the High Court for the State of Telangana has issued a notification Vide ROC No 45/2025-RC, dt 01-12-2025, for filling up 94 vacancies of Junior Civil Judge (Junior Division) fixing the last date for submission of applications as 29-12-2025. At present, the scrutiny of the applications received is under process. The tentative date for conducting the screening test is in the month of February/March, 2026.

FILLING UP OF VACANCIES UNDER DIRECT RECRUITMENT IN THE SERVICE OF THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

The High Court has issued Notification Nos. 101/2025 to 108/2025, dated 02-01-2025 inviting applications through online for filling up of a total 212 posts in the Service of the High Court, and the last date for submission of applications through online was fixed as 31-01-2025. As per schedule fixed, the Tata Consultancy Services Limited have conducted the computer based examinations and skill tests on 18-04-2025, 19-04-2025 and 20-04-2025 in three (03) shifts per day at 95 Centres in the State of Telangana, in connection with the direct recruitment in various categories under the Service of the High Court for the State of Telangana, notified on 02-01-2025. Further, the OMR based examinations was conducted to the post of Office Subordinate in the State of Telangana to the notification No. 108/2025 on 22-06-2025 under the Service of the High Court for the State of Telangana, notified on 02-01-2025.

The technical/skill test for the post of Court Masters/Personal Secretaries to the Hon'ble Judges and Registrars notified under the notification No.101/2025 dated



02- 01-2025 in Services of the High Court for the State of Telangana is conducted on 05- 05-2025 (Monday).

Further, on 23-06-2025 the High Court declared the provisional selection of the hall ticket numbers of the candidates and forwarded the list to Registrar (Administration), High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad for issuing Appointment Orders.

Further, on 23-09-2025 the High Court declared the provisional selection of the hall ticket numbers of the candidates for the post of Typist and Copyist notified under the notification No.105/2025 and 106/2025, dated 02-01-2025 in Services of the High Court for the State of Telangana and forwarded the list to Registrar (Administration), High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad for issuing Appointment Orders.

Further, on 25-07-2025 the High Court declared the provisional selection of the hall ticket numbers of the candidates for certificate verification prior to the oral interview in the categories of Computer Operator, Assistant, Examiner, Typist, Copyist, System Assistant and Office Subordinate and hosted a notification on 28-07-2025 in the website of High Court for verification of original certificates verification to be conducted from 01-08-2025 to 29-08-2025.

Further, the High Court scrutinized the applications and prepared the eligible and ineligible list and placed the same in the website of the High Court. Accordingly, oral interviews were conducted to the posts of Assistant, Examiner and System Assistant.

Further, the High Court conducted original certificate verification from 01-08-2025 to 29-08-2025 in the categories of Computer Operator, Assistant, Examiner, Typist, Copyist, System Assistant and office Subordinate and after verification of original certificates, the High Court conducted oral interviews to the post of Typist, Copyists, Examiner, Assistant, System Assistant and Computer Operator.

Further, on 23-09-2025 the High Court declared the hall ticket numbers of provisionally selected candidates in the categories Typist and Copyist and on 20-12-2025 the High Court.

Further declared the Hall ticket numbers of provisionally selected candidates in the categories of Computer operators, Assistant, Examiner and System Assistant.



Further Recruitment process is in progress such as certificate verification of the provisionally selected candidates, verifications of antecedents, selection of the candidates, and issuance of appointment orders etc.

Sanctioned strength, working strength and vacancy position of Ministerial Staff in District Courts as on 31.12.2025



Sanctioned strength	11093
Working strength	6963
Vacancies	4130

FILLING UP OF VACANCIES UNDER DIRECT RECRUITMENT IN THE TELANGANA JUDICIAL AND MINISTERIAL SERVICE

The High Court has taken steps for centralized direct recruitment process to the posts in the Telangana Judicial and Ministerial Services, by utilizing the technical/online services of Tata Consultancy Services Limited. Accordingly, the High Court issued Notification Nos. 1/2025 to 9/2025 dated 02-01-2025 inviting applications through online for filling up of a total 1461 posts in various categories in the Telangana Judicial Ministerial & Subordinate Service, for maintaining confidentiality, transparency and to overcome the delay in recruitment process and the last date for submission of applications through online was fixed as 31-01-2025. As per schedule fixed, the Tata Consultancy Services Limited have conducted the computer based examinations on 15-04-2025, 16-04-2025 and 20-04-2025 in three

(03) shifts per day at 95 Centres in the State of Telangana, in connection with the direct recruitment in various categories under Telangana Judicial Ministerial and Subordinate Service, notified on 02-01-2025.

Further, the OMR based examinations was conducted for the posts of Process Server and Office Subordinate, in the State of Telangana to the notifications Nos. 8/2025 and 9/2025 on 21-06-2025 in two shifts for notified posts under Telangana Judicial Ministerial Services and the technical/skill test for the post of Stenographer Grade-III, notified under the notification No.1/2025 dated 02-01-2025 under



Telangana Judicial Ministerial Services is conducted on 30-08-2025 (Saturday) and 31-08-2025 (Sunday).

Further, on 18-09-2025 the High Court declared the provisional selection of the hall ticket numbers of the candidates for certificate verification to the posts of Junior Assistant, Field Assistant, Examiner and Record Assistant for notified posts under Telangana Judicial Ministerial Services and on 23-09-2025 the High Court declared the provisional selection of the hall ticket numbers of the candidates for certificate verification to the posts of Typist and Copyist.

Further, on 27-10-2025 the High Court declared the provisional selection of the hall ticket numbers of the candidates for certificate verification for the post of Stenographer Grade-III notified under the notification No.1/2025 dated 02-01-2025 under Telangana Judicial Ministerial Services.

Further, on 27-10-2025 the High Court declared the provisional selection of the hall ticket numbers short listed in the ratio of 1:3 for the post of Process Server and Office Subordinate of the notified vacancies in their respective categories for certificate verification prior to oral interviews.

Further, a letter from the High Court sent to the concerned Principal District Judges requesting to cause verification of original certificates in respect of the provisionally selected candidates which were conducted in the Offices of the concerned Principal District Courts/Units wherein the posts notified for direct recruitment for the Year 2025.

Further High Court issued Recruitment process is in progress such as antecedents and issuance of appointment orders etc.



District-wise Statement of Institutions, Disposals and Pendency of Cases from 01.07.2025 to 31.12.2025



Sl.No	NAME OF THE DISTRICT / UNIT	CIVIL			CRIMINAL		
		INSTITUTION	DISPOSAL	PENDENCY	INSTITUTION	DISPOSAL	PENDENCY
1	ADILABAD	599	469	2,294	2,202	2,029	7,358
2	KUMURAMBHEEM ASIFABAD	72	79	1,298	1,199	978	4,106
3	MANCHERIAL	707	694	6,108	3,376	3,242	13,928
4	NIRMAL	216	286	1,939	917	1,075	5,723
5	HYDERABAD - i) CITY CIVIL COURTS	5,394	4,970	53,832	163	157	1,871
6	ii) CITY SMALL CAUSES COURTS	86	133	1,159	0	0	0
7	iii) METROPOLITAN CRIMINAL COURTS	0	0	0	31,503	32,008	1,12,549
8	iv) CBI UNIT	0	0	0	213	58	2,400
9	v) TRIBUNALS	124	137	2,919	0	4	13
10	KARIMNAGAR	891	1,351	12,600	2,017	1,753	26,306
11	JAGTIAL	497	485	5,028	1,131	1,249	11,709
12	PEDDAPALLY	1,041	1,085	6,090	1,551	1,076	12,421
13	RAJANNA SIRCILLA	354	405	4,474	1,545	1,153	9,184
14	KHAMMAM	1,402	1,860	12,395	9,153	7,865	24,033
15	BADRADRI KOTHAGUDEM	406	438	3,397	1,777	1,644	18,807
16	MAHABUBNAGAR	456	591	6,715	978	963	11,688
17	JOGULAMBA GADWAL	293	352	3,283	3,084	3,306	4,541
18	NAGARKURNOOL	393	456	6,284	857	800	7,803
19	NARAYANPET	166	100	2,474	521	402	4,455
20	WANAPARTHY	784	1,090	4,531	2,805	2,750	6,842
21	MEDAK	591	705	3,641	1,653	1,903	9,855
22	SANGAREDDY	1,920	1,944	16,040	3,179	2,991	18,924
23	SIDDIPET	1,078	1,129	9,146	3,870	3,861	15,153
24	NALGONDA	1,409	1,209	14,944	2,257	1,689	27,260
25	SURYAPET	964	1,083	8,095	1,901	1,806	19,583
26	YADADRI BHUVANAGIRI	482	422	9,191	1,617	1,522	13,349
27	NIZAMABAD	929	1,215	8,083	1,822	1,564	17,912
28	KAMAREDDY	198	453	3,419	919	764	10,808
29	RANGAREDDY	23,831	23,009	49,800	12,661	10,325	74,530
30	MEDCHAL-MALKAJGIRI	5,510	5,893	33,206	5,473	4,287	61,178
31	VIKARABAD	431	514	7,935	971	867	10,396
32	WARANGAL	614	902	9,063	1,296	967	14,630
33	HANUMAKONDA	1,111	1,434	14,757	1,420	1,276	17,712
34	JANGAON	351	403	5,939	495	665	6,112
35	JAYASHANKAR BHUPALAPALLY	263	322	2,256	605	559	6,672
36	MAHABUBABAD	244	253	3,463	786	1,278	8,515
37	MULUGU	55	67	726	297	297	2,746
GRAND TOTAL		53,862	55,938	3,36,524	1,06,214	99,133	6,21,072



On 28.10.2025, the Hon'ble Sri Justice Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Executive Chairman, TSLSA has conducted a meeting with the Director General of Police, Telangana and other Government officials pertaining to Special Lok Adalat held in the month of November, 2025.



As per the guidance of the NALSA, for ensuring effective legal representation to legal aid beneficiaries, and in accordance with the directions of the Hon'ble Sri Justice Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Executive Chairman, TSLSA, the Two Day Refresher Training Programme was conducted for the newly engaged 86 Legal Aid Defence Counsel, in consultation with the Telangana State Judicial Academy on 15th & 16th November, 2025. Hon'ble Smt. Justice Moushumi Bhattacharya, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana have participated in the programme.



Telangana State Legal Services Authority, organized Special Lok Adalat for the disposal of NI Act Cases pending before the Courts in the State on 15.11.2025. Hon'ble Sri Justice Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Executive Chairman, TSLSA has inaugurated the Special Lok Adalat Bench at City Civil Court Legal Services Authority, Hyderabad.



Telangana State Legal Services Authority, Hyderabad organized Special Lok Adalat for the disposal of NI Act Cases pending before the Court in the State on 15.11.2025. Hon'ble Sri Justice K. Lakshman, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana inaugurated Special Lok Adalat Bench at DLSA, Medchal Malkajgiri.



On 24.11.2025, the Member Secretary, TSLSA has participated as Speaker on “State Level Conference on Key Child Rights issues” at Dr. MCR HRD Institute, Hyderabad. The Member Secretary created awareness among the public on legal aid and Victim Compensation.



Osmania University of Law, Hyderabad has conducted 76th Constitution Day, 2025 on 26.11.2025, in which the Member Secretary, TSLSA has participated as Guest of Honour and also created awareness among the students.



On 18.11.2025, as per the directions of the Member Secretary, TSLSA, the Administrative Officer, TSLSA has visited the Special Home for Boys at Bachupally, Medchal Malkajgiri and interacted with the inmates and also inspected the dormitory and kitchen area found to be hygienic and well organized.



Telangana Mediation & Arbitration Centre, Hyderabad has conducted 40 hours Mediation Training for the empanelled Advocates for Nalgonda cluster (Nalgonda, Suryapet and Yadadri Bhuvanagiri Districts) from 23rd November to 27th November, 2025 at Nalgonda.



Telangana Mediation & Arbitration Centre, Hyderabad has conducted 40 hours Mediation Training for the empanelled Advocates of Adilabad, Nirmal, Kumurambheem Asifabad, Mancherial and Nizamabad districts from 02.11.2025 to 06.11.2025 at DLSA, Nirmal. Hon'ble Sri Justice, K. Lakshman, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana and the Member Secretary, TSLSA have participated in the programme.



The Secretary of the District Legal Services Authority (DLSA), Medchal–Malkajgiri, inaugurated a De-Addiction Centre at the Legal Aid Clinic, marking a significant step towards addressing substance abuse and promoting public health in the district. The initiative aims to provide counselling, rehabilitation support, and legal awareness to individuals struggling with addiction. It is expected to benefit not only affected individuals but also their families by creating a support system within the community.



On 10-10-2025, the Secretary of the Metropolitan Legal Services Authority (MLSA), Hyderabad, conducted a medical camp in collaboration with the MCC Bar Association, Nampally, Hyderabad. The camp aimed to provide basic healthcare services to the public, along with spreading awareness about legal aid and access to justice. Several beneficiaries availed medical consultations and guidance during the programme



“On the occasion of Legal Services Day, 2025, observed on 09-11-2025, all the District Legal Services Authorities (DLSAs) in the State of Telangana conducted various programmes, including legal awareness camps, Lok Adalats, and public outreach initiatives, highlighting the importance of free legal aid and access to justice for all sections of society.”



All the District Legal Services Authorities (DLSAs) in the State of Telangana conducted Children's Day 2025 on 14.11.2025 –

The programmes were organized across all districts to promote awareness about the rights, welfare, and protection of children. Various activities such as legal awareness sessions, interactive programmes in schools, cultural events, and distribution of educational materials were conducted. The initiatives aimed to sensitize children, parents, and the community about child rights and the role of legal services institutions in ensuring access to justice and support for children in need.



On 13th December 2025, a one-day sensitization programme for Referral Judges on the ADR mechanism was conducted at the Telangana State Judicial Academy. Hon'ble Executive Chairman and other Hon'ble Judges of the High Court for the State of Telangana participated in the training. The programme focused on strengthening the understanding and effective implementation of Alternative Dispute Resolution mechanisms, including mediation, conciliation, and Lok Adalats. Emphasis was laid on the role of Referral Judges in identifying suitable cases for ADR and facilitating timely, cost-effective dispute resolution. Interactive sessions and expert deliberations provided practical insights to enhance the efficiency of the justice delivery system.



Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Executive Chairman, TSLSA and Hon'ble Sri Justice K. Lakshman, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana have participated in the World Human Rights Day, 2025 on 10th December, 2025 at the Institute of Mental Health, Erragadda, Hyderabad.



Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Executive Chairman, TSLSA convened a meeting with police officials regarding the National Lok Adalat scheduled on 06.12.2025. During the meeting, detailed discussions were held on the identification and categorization of suitable cases for settlement in the upcoming Lok Adalat. The police officials were requested to extend full cooperation in facilitating pre-litigation and pending cases, particularly those relating to compoundable offences, traffic challans, and other minor disputes. Emphasis was laid on effective coordination between the police department and legal services institutions to ensure maximum disposal of cases and to promote amicable resolution of disputes.



SUCCESS STORIES

SUCCESS STORY IN FPCL 71/ 2025:

With the intervention of the City Civil Court Legal Services Authority, Hyderabad, one person namely Ayesha Hasan approached the DLSA, filed a petition for conciliation between her and her husband regarding the matrimonial dispute. The officer and the panel lawyer counselled and settled the matrimonial dispute between Smt. Ayesha Hasan and Sri. MD. Shaker and both wife and husband are living amicably. As a result of the effect step, both the parties are living life happily with their children.

SUCCESS STORY IN FPLC 106/2025:

With the intervention of the City Civil Court Legal Services Authority, Hyderabad, one person namely CH. Shirisha approached the DLSA, filed a petition for conciliation between her and her husband regarding the matrimonial dispute in SC/ST Mediation Centre, Mothinagar. Counselling was held for both and approached this authority for settlement of the matter. The officer and the panel lawyer have counselled and settled the matrimonial dispute between Smt.CH. Shirisha and Sri. A. Pawan Kumar and both wife and husband are living amicably. As a result of the effective step, both the parties are living life happily with their children.

SUCCESS STORY IN FPLC 61/2025:

With the intervention of the City Civil Court Legal Services Authority, Hyderabad, one person namely Sri T.A.N.N. Ravi Prasad approached the DLSA, filed a petition for conciliation between him and his wife regarding the matrimonial dispute. The officer and the panel lawyer counselled and settled the matrimonial dispute between Sri. T.A.N.N Ravi Prasad and Smt. Khushbu Khatri and both wife and husband are living amicably. As a result of the effective step, both the parties are living life happily with their children.

SUCCESS STORY IN CPLC 82/2025:

With the intervention of the City Civil Court Legal Services Authority, Hyderabad, one person by name R.Raja Ram approached the DLSA, filed a petition regarding property dispute. The officer and the panel lawyer counselled and settled the dispute between Sri. R.Raja Ram and Smt. Kantha Lakshmi & Sri. Ravi Kiran. As a result of it, both the parties stated that they do not have any property dispute and respondents agreed to pay monthly maintenance, buss pass amount to Sri. R.Raja Ram.



✚ The Petitioner Mohammed Rahiman, S/o Md.Babu Miya, Mahabubnagar filed PLC on 13.10.2025 stating that the Respondent is running Private Chit Fund Company and the petitioner joined in the group and paid 25 installments instead of 40 and stopped paying due to ill health. The duration of the chit is completed, but the respondent is evading to pay the chit amount. The petitioner approached the DLSA, Mahabubnagar. The DLSA has counseled both the parties and settled the matter amicably.

✚ In the 4th National Lok Adalat, which is held on 21.12.2025, a 30 years old dispute was settled between two brothers in a pre-litigation case. One brother filed a suit against another brother, which was dismissed by the trial court. Later, the matter was carried to First Appellate Court, which also confirmed the trial court decision. After exhausting 30 years of litigation and facing the prospects of a second appeal in the Hon'ble High Court, the siblings realized that the land costs them more in legal expenses and broken their relationship than its actual worth. In late, 2025, rather than filing petitions, both families sat together and settled all the issues. Finally, an amicable settlement was arrived at in the National Lok Adalat organized in DLSA, Nirmal. As the matter is settled amicably in this Lok Adalat, both the families left the court premises together happily.

In the Hon'ble High Court, Hon'ble Sri Justice Nagesh Bheemapaka, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana and Hon'ble Sri Justice Gouse Meera Mohiuddin, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana held the Lok Adalat Benches for recording the compromise of cases in which parties have come before the Benches stating that they have settled their disputes. Totally 129 cases were disposed of and an amount of Rs. 11 crores is awarded by the Hon'ble Judges while holding Two Lok Adalat Benches.

✚ As per instructions of the Member Secretary, Telangana State Legal Services Authority, titled 'Chaliki Chachipoyela unna Cheyi Chachi Yachisthunna Intiki Thisukupo Bidda' published on 18.12.2025 in Eanadu daily newspaper and on instructions of the Chairman, Mandal Legal Services Committee, Rajendranagar, Principal Senior Civil Judge, Rajendranagar took as suomoto case and sent the court constables and PLV for enquiry. The person by name Dappu Mallaiah, who is begging under the Rallaguda flyover, Shadnagar, was admitted in Old age Home at Abdullapurmet. After that the Senior Civil Judge issued notices to the sons of the old aged, conducted counselling and directed them to look after their father and on the assurance of sons, said Mallaiah was sent to home with his children.



REGULAR LOK ADALATS:

In the Regular Lok Adalats, conducted during the months of October, 2025 to December, 2025, 19,289 cases were settled (598 Pre-Litigation cases and 18,691 pending cases) and an amount of Rs. 2,25,28,99,639/-, was awarded as compensation.

National Lok Adalat :

On 21.12.2025, National Lok Adalat was successfully conducted throughout the State of Telangana. A total number of 19,65,629 cases (i.e. 2,41,886 pre-litigation and 17,23,743 pending litigation) cases were disposed of and an amount of Rs.34,18,84,89,368/- was awarded as compensation.

Legal Aid Beneficiaries:

During the months of October, 2025 to December, 2025, the Legal Services Institutions appointed 1,760 Panel Advocates to the needy persons and legal advice was given to 3,241 persons.



**HIGH COURT LEGAL SERVICES COMMITTEE
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA**



***Lok Adalats conducted and cases settled during the
period from 1st Oct 2025 to 31st Dec, 2025***

Sl. No.	Date of Lok Adalat	Number of Cases Settled	Compensation Amount
1.	15.11.2025 (Special Lok Adalat)	25	86,58,550/-
2.	21.12.2025 (National Lok Adalat)	129	11,00,00,000/-
	Total	154	118,658,550/-

b) Providing Legal Aid

During the period from 01.10.2025 to 31.12.2025, this office has provided Legal Aid and Advice/ Counseling to 365 applicants/ Petitioners.

c) Identification of parties in Criminal Petitions/ Criminal Revision Cases/ Writ Petitions etc.:

This office is also taking up the work of recording compromise in Criminal Petitions/Criminal Revisions cases/ Writ Petitions etc., as directed by the Hon'ble High Court. 198 are such cases done by this office during the period from 01.10.2025 to 31.12.2025.



Five Months training in Final Spell III foundation Course for Additional District Judges



Telangana State Judicial Academy has conducted Five Months training in Final Spell III foundation Course for Additional District Judges, which concluded on 29.11.2025. The Course has been designed to give benefit of practical exposure and theoretical class. Special Sessions were conducted on Powers of Drawing and Disbursing Officers, Execution of Decrees, Wildlife Protection Act, Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, POSH Act, and Applying gender perspective in the administration of Justice, Mental Health Act, and One Day dedicated session was arranged on the aspects of Mental Health Act; Cognitive Psychology; Mental Health disorders-treatment and challenges. Special emphasis was also made on the advantages of Electronic and Information Technology by conducting ECT_17_2025 on 22nd and 23rd November, 2025. During these sessions several resource persons which includes Hon'ble Sri Justice B. Vijaysen Reddy, Hon'ble Sri Justice K. Lakshman and Hon'ble Sri Justice Nandikonda Narsing Rao have taken the sessions and guided the Trainee District Judges. After completion of prescribed training examinations were conducted and Valedictory Session was held on 29.11.2025 which was graced by Hon'ble Sri Justice B. Vijaysen Reddy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana. The participant officers have presented the course evaluation report there upon the Hon'ble Sri Justice B. Vijaysen Reddy has presented course completion certificates to the Trainee Judicial Officers.

Three Months training in First Spell for V Basic Course for the newly appointed 49 Junior Civil Judges from 01.09.2025 to 29.11.2025.



Telangana State Judicial Academy has also conducted Three Months training in First Spell for V Basic Course for the newly appointed 49 Junior Civil Judges from 01.09.2025 to 29.11.2025. The Course has been designed to give benefit of both theoretical and practical training to the Trainee Judicial Officers. The Course has been designed to give benefit of practical exposure and theoretical class. Special Sessions were conducted on Powers of Drawing and Disbursing Officers, Execution of Decrees, Wildlife Protection Act, Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, POSH Act, and Applying gender perspective in the administration of Justice, Mental Health Act, and One Day dedicated session was arranged on the aspects of Mental Health Act; Cognitive Psychology; Mental Health disorders-treatment and challenges. Since the officers were newly inducted into the service thereby to adopt themselves to the Court Room atmospheres several Mock Court Sessions were held to deal with different situation i.e. Remand, 164 CrPC Statement Recording, Test of Identification Parade, Recording of dying declaration, Writing of Bail Orders, Property Order, Cognizance Orders, Examination of the Accused, Writing of Judgements. On Civil side writing of Out-off Order petition, Adjournment petition, Interlocutory Applications, Framing of Issues, Recording of Evidence of witnesses and Writing of Civil Judgements. Special emphasis was also made on the advantages of Electronic and Information Technology by conducting ECT_18_2025 on 22nd and 23rd November, 2025. During these sessions several resource persons which includes Hon'ble Sri Justice B. Vijaysen Reddy, Hon'ble Sri Justice K. Lakshman and Hon'ble Sri Justice Nandikonda Narsing Rao have taken the sessions and guided the Trainee Junior Civil Judges. At the end of the Spell-I an examination was also conducted to the trainee judicial officers on both Civil and Criminal subjects.



Training Sessions to 07 Junior Civil Judges recruited in the year 2024

Telangana State Judicial Academy is also conducting Training Sessions to 07 Junior Civil Judges recruited in the year 2024 from 01.12.2025 to 28.02.2026. On the commencement day the Director (FAC) has interacted with the trainee officers with regard to their practical difficulties while conducting the bench. During this period sessions were held on the aspects of Appreciation of Evidence in civil and criminal matters, Adding of parties, 311 and 313 of CrPC, E.P's and Session on DVC Act, 138 NI Act, Summary Suits, Trial of Warrant Cases instuted otherwise on police report. on 13.12.2025 all the trainee officers were nominated to attend One Day Sensitization Training Programme on the Role of Referral Judges in Mediation. During this period from 15.12.2025 to 20.12.2025 the trainee officers have visited Forensic Science Laboratory in Redhill, Hyderabad and equipped themselves on the aspects of importance of Forensic Science in the adjudication process. Thereafter, three day dedicated sessions were held on the Forensic Medicine which includes Human Anatomy and Physiology, Fire arms wounds, Medico-legal aspects, Injuries in road traffic cases, Abortion, Miscarriage, Infanticide, Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971, Pre-conception and prenatal diagnostic techniques (Prevention of Sex Determination) Act, Medical Negligence and Scope of Consumer Protection Act in Medical negligence cases were dealt. These sessions were taken by Dr. R. Sudha, porf. Forensic Medicine, Osmania Medical College, Hyderabad and Dr. R. Jagan, Tutor Forensic Medicine, Osmania Medical College and also Dr. T. Krupal Singh, Prof. and HOD Forensic Medicine on Toxicology Gandhi Medical College, Secunderabad.

Two Days Training Sessions to Legal Aid Defence Counsels

On 15.11.2025 and 16.11.2025 Telangana State Legal Service Authorities has conducted Two Days Training Sessions to Legal Aid Defence Counsels at Telangana State Judicial Academy, Secunderabad. All the trainee junior civil judges and district judges were nominated to participate in the programme.



Training Sessions to 03 Junior Civil Judges recruited in the year 2023



Telangana State Judicial Academy conducted Training Sessions to 03 Junior Civil Judges recruited in the year 2023 from 01.12.2025 to 31.01.2026. On the commencement day the Director (FAC) has interacted with the trainee officers with regard to their practical difficulties while conducting the bench. During this period they have visited Civil Court from 01.12.2025 to 06.12.2025 and Criminal Courts from 08.12.2025 to 12.12.2025. On 13.12.2025 all the trainee officers were nominated to attend One Day Sensitization Training Programme on the Role of Referral Judges in Mediation. During this period from 15.12.2025 to 20.12.2025 the trainee officers have visited Forensic Science Laboratory in Redhill, Hyderabad and equipped themselves on the aspects of importance of Forensic Science in the adjudication process. Thereafter, three day dedicated sessions were held on the Forensic Medicine which includes Human Anatomy and Physiology, Fire arms wounds, Medico-legal aspects, Injuries in road traffic cases, Abortion, Miscarriage, Infanticide, Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971, Pre-conception and prenatal diagnostic techniques (Prevention of Sex Determination) Act, Medical Negligence and Scope of Consumer Protection Act in Medical negligence cases were dealt. These sessions were taken by Dr. R. Sudha, prof. Forensic Medicine, Osmania Medical College, Hyderabad and Dr. R. Jagan, Tutor Forensic Medicine, Osmania Medical College and also Dr. T. Krupal Singh, Prof. and HOD Forensic Medicine on Toxicology Gandhi Medical College, Secunderabad.



E.C.T Programmes

ECT 11 2025

ECT_11_2025 was held on 18.10.2025 at the Telangana State Judicial Academy, Secunderabad which was attended by 80 nominated participants working in High Court of Telangana, District System Administrators and System Assistants working in the District Judiciary. The training covered Hardware & Software Mainitenace, Data Replication, Data Monitoring, V.C. equipments and LAN Connections were dealt by NIC, Hyderabad team headed by Mr. Shivaramulu.



ECT 15 2025

ECT_15_2025 was held on 20.12.2025 at the Telangana State Judicial Academy, Secunderabad which was attended by 91 nominated participants who are working in the High Court for the State of Telangana. The training covered Orientation and Overview of the computer infrastructure, Hardware & Software; E-filing, Tools for Paperless court, video conferencing and hybrid hearing, Working in Cyberspace and Basics of Networking, Data Management and an overview of Servers were dealt by NIC, Hyderabad team headed by Sri G. Appi Reddy, Director.



Inaugurations in District Courts



Laying foundation stone for construction of 10+2 Court building , at Jangaon on 18.10.2025



Laying of foundation stone for construction of 10+2 Court building complex including Family Court and POCSO Courts Buildings at Jangaon was laid by Hon'ble Sri Justice B. Vijaysen Reddy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Administrative Judge of Jangaon District in the august presence of Hon'ble Sri Justice Namavarapu Rajeshwar Rao, Hon'ble Sri Justice B.R Madhusudhan Rao and Hon'ble Sri Justice Suddala Chalapathi Rao, Judges, High Court for the State of Telangana. The said programme was organised under the guidance of the Principle District Judge, Jangaon District and Judicial Officers and BAR Members from this District took part in the programme.



Laying foundation stone for construction of 10+2 Court building , at Mulugu
on 01.11.2025



Laying of foundation stone for construction of 10+2 Court building complex including Family Court and POCSO Courts Buildings at Mulugu was laid by Hon'ble Sri Justice Aparesh Kumar, the Chief Justice, High Court for the State of Telangana, in the august presence of Hon'ble Sri Justice E.V. Venugopal, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Administrative Judge, Mulugu District and Hon'ble Sri Justice Namavarapu Rajeshwar Rao, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana. The said programme was organised under the guidance of the Principle District Judge, Mulugu District and Judicial Officers and BAR Members from this District took part in the programme.



Laying foundation stone for construction of 10+2 Court building at Jayashankar Bhupalpally on 01.11.2025



Laying of foundation stone for construction of 10+2 Court building complex including Family Court and POCSO Courts Buildings at Jayashankar Bhupalpally was laid by Hon'ble Sri Justice Aparesh Kumar, the Chief Justice, High Court for the State of Telangana, in the august presence of Hon'ble Sri Justice E.V. Venugopal, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Administrative Judge, Jayashankar Bhupalpally District and Hon'ble Sri Justice Namavarapu Rajeshwar Rao, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana. The said programme was organised under the guidance of the Principle District Judge, Jayashankar Bhupalpally District and Judicial Officers and BAR Members from this District took part in the programme.



Laying foundation stone for construction of 10+2 Court building at Mahabubnagar
on 27.12.2025



Laying of foundation stone for construction of 10+2 Court building complex including Family Court and POCOS Courts Buildings at Mahabubnagar was laid by Hon'ble Sri Justice N.V. Sharavan Kumar, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Administrative Judge of Mahabubnagar District, in the august presence of Hon'ble Sri Justice K.Lakshman, Hon'ble Sri Justice B. Vijaysen Reddy, Hon'ble Smt. Justice T. Madhavi Latha, Hon'ble Sri Justice Narsing Rao Nandikonda, Judges, High Court for the State of Telangana. The said programme was organised under the guidance of the Principle District Judge, Mahabubnagar District and Judicial Officers and BAR Members from this District took part in the programme.



**Inauguration of Quarter or Court Building / Laying of foundation stone for
construction of Courts**

Sl. No	Name of the Quarter/Court Building	Date of inauguration	Number of courts
1.	Additional Junior Civil Judge-cum-Judicial Magistrate of First Class Court at Sulthanabad, Peddapalli District	06.12.2025	Self Owned
2.	two (2) Additional Junior Civil Judge-cum-Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class Courts at Jayashankar Bhupalpally	20.12.2025	Private 2 Courts
3.	Principal Family Court, Medchal Malkajgiri District	29.12.2025	Private
4.	Additional Family Court, Medchal Malkajgiri District	29.12.2025	Private
5.	Additional District & Sessions Court, Medchal Malkajgiri District	29.12.2025	Private
6.	Junior Civil Court, Medchal Malkajgiri District	29.12.2025	Private
7.	Shifting court of Principal I Junior Civil Judge-cum-Judicial Magistrate of First Class from RR District to Medchal Malkajgiri District in Uppal at Medipally	30.12.2025	Private
8.	Shifting court of I Addl. Junior Civil Judge-cum-V Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class from R.R District to Medchal Malkajgiri District in Uppal at Medipally	30.12.2025	Private
9.	Shifting court of II Additional Junior Civil Judge-cum-VI Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class from R.R District to Medchal Malkajgiri District in Uppal at Medipally	30.12.2025	Private

