



High Court for the State of Telangana

e-Newsletter

**Volume VIII – Issue 1
(Jan 2026 to Mar 2026)**



Editorial Board for e-Newsletter



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



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



**Hon'ble Sri Justice
Nagesh Bheemapaka**

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Sri D. Kiran Kumar, Registrar (IT)-cum-CPC.

Sri A.H.S.Gowri Shankar, Assistant Registrar.

COMPILED BY

Sri G. Samrat, Court Manager.

ASSISTED BY

Sri Ravi Tumu., Section Officer.

Ms. Gopika Menon, Asst. Librarian.

Foreword

As we turn the page to the new year, the Hon'ble editorial board of the High Court of the State of Telangana for e-Newsletter wishes everyone a prosperous and successful year. The new year got off to a flying start with the inauguration of the **All India High Court Staff Cricket Tournament** on 12th January 2026 at the CNR Cricket Ground in Nagole. The said event was organised jointly by the High Court Employees Federation and the Telangana High Court Service Association. The five-day cricket tournament was inaugurated by the Hon'ble Sri Justice B. Vijaysen Reddy, Chairman of the High Court Sports Committee, and the Hon'ble Sri Justice K. Sarath. The final match was played between the teams from Gujarat and Jammu and Kashmir, with Gujarat emerging victorious.

On 24 January 2026, the Telangana State Legal Services Authority, in association with the Hyderabad District Legal Services Authority, organised a 2K run to raise awareness of the rights and protection of girls on National Girl Child Day. The Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Executive Chairman of the State Legal Services Authority, flagged off the programme and said that women are leading the way in every sector, including the judiciary. Hon'ble Mrs Justice Surepalli Nanda also spoke at the event, emphasising the need to eradicate gender discrimination and the importance of girls' education. The **77th Republic Day celebrations** were held at the High Court on 26th January 2026. Hon'ble The Chief Justice, Aparesh Kumar Singh, unfurled the National flag on this auspicious occasion. His Lordship emphasised that the constitution should reach every person and every household, not just the courts.

The National Lok Adalat, held on 28 March 2026, resolved a record 144,251 cases, which is 37.14 per cent more than the Lok Adalat held in December last year, to resolve disputes and deliver speedy justice.

All Supreme Court and High Court verdicts are made available in local languages. A **Special Wing has been set up at the High Court** to oversee this process. Thanks to their efforts, the verdicts are being translated into the local language of Telugu, so that every citizen in Telangana can understand the Judgements/ Verdicts.

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 31.03.2026	69
Sanctioned strength, working strength and vacancy position of Judicial Officers in the State of Telangana as on 31.03.2026.....	71
Sanctioned strength, working strength and vacancy position of Ministerial Staff in District Courts as on 31.03.2026.....	73
District-wise Statement of Institutions, disposal and pendency of Cases from 01.01.2026 to 31.03.2026	74
Activities of Telangana State Legal Services Authority	75
Telangana State Judicial Academy - Important events	85
Inaugurations in District Courts	92

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



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



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



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



Sri V. Ramesh
Registrar (OSD)
reg.mgt-tshc@aij.gov.in



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



Events of the High Court

Republic day celebrations in the High Court for the State of Telangana on 26.01.2026



Hon'ble Sri Justice Sri Aparesh Kumar Singh, Chief Justice, High Court for the State of Telangana, unfurled the National Flag in the august presence of all Hon'ble Judges of the High Court for the State of Telangana, in the High Court premises, on the eve of 76th Republic Day Celebrations.



South Zone-II Regional Conference At Hyderabad
on 14th & 15th MARCH, 2026





High Court for the State of Telangana and Telangana State Judicial Academy in collaboration with National Judicial Academy, organized South Zone-II Regional Conference on “Advancing Rule of Law Through Technology: Challenges & Opportunities on 14th and 15th March 2026, at Novotel, HICC Complex (Near Hitex, Hyderabad). The said conference brought together three (3) Hon’ble Judges from Supreme Court of India along with more than 130 judicial officers from southern states along with Hon’ble Chief Justices and Hon’ble Judges of various High Courts, including the Hon’ble Judges of High Court for the State of Telangana. The conference was held in the august presence of Hon’ble Sri Justice Vikram Nath, Judge, Supreme Court of India, Hon’ble Sri Justice S.V.Bhatti, Judge, Supreme Court of India, Hon’ble Sri Justice Satish Chandra Sharma, Judge, Supreme Court of India. Hon’ble Sri Justice Vikram Nath, Judge, Supreme Court of India delivered a key address, cautioning against the uncritical use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the legal framework.

Hon’ble Sri Justice Sri Aparesh Kumar Singh, Chief Justice, High Court for the State of Telangana delivered a key address highlighting the growing challenge of balancing the freedom of expression in the digital age with the necessity of preserving the fairness and integrity of judicial proceedings.

Key Discussions: Hon’ble Supreme Court of India Judges (including Hon’ble Sri Justice Vikram Nath, Judge, Supreme Court of India), Senior judicial officers and technical experts, led sessions addressing the practical challenges of integrating AI, cloud storage, and secure digital infrastructure into standard court procedures.





**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: Rule 3(xi) of the Telangana State Public Service Commission Rules of Procedure (Rules of Procedure), etc.

Case Details: Telangana Public Service Commission, rep. by its Secretary, M.J.Road, Nampally, Hyderabad, Telangana State and others. **Vs** Paramesh Matta and others in WRIT APPEAL Nos. 1066 and others of 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 05-02-2026 (*per the Hon'ble the Chief Justice Sri Aparesk Kumar Singh*)

Facts: The present writ appeals, except W.A.No.1470 of 2025, have been preferred by the Telangana Public Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as 'the Commission') and the successful candidates aggrieved by the judgment dated 09.09.2025 passed in W.P.No.11439 of 2025 and batch by the learned writ court.

The writ appeal No.1470 of 2025 has been preferred by the writ petitioners in the nature of cross-appeal questioning the direction of the learned writ court to the Commission to conduct re-evaluation by following the method of moderation as prescribed in the case of **Sanjay Singh vs. U.P.Public Service Commission, Allahabad [(2007) 3 SCC 720]** . Instead, it has been prayed that the learned writ court should have confined the relief to re-conduct the Mains examination under the recruitment Notification No.02/2024, dated 19.02.2024.

Facts: In **Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education vs. Paritosh Bhupesh Kumar Sheth [(1984) 4 SCC 27]**, the apex court has held that the court should be extremely reluctant to substitute its own views in relation to academic matters in preference to those formulated by professional men possessing technical expertise and rich experience. Para 29 of the aforesaid judgment is extracted as under:

“29. Far from advancing public interest and fair play to the other candidates in general, any such interpretation of the legal position would be wholly defensive of the same. As has been repeatedly pointed out by this Court, the Court should be extremely reluctant to substitute its own views as to what is wise, prudent and proper in relation to academic matters in preference to those formulated



by professional men possessing technical expertise and rich experience of actual day-to-day working of educational institutions and the departments controlling them. It will be wholly wrong for the Court to make a pedantic and purely idealistic approach to the problems of this nature, isolated from the actual realities and grass root problems involved in the working of the system and unmindful of the consequences which would emanate if a purely idealistic view as opposed to a pragmatic one were to be propounded. It is equally important that the Court should also, as far as possible, avoid any decision or interpretation of a statutory provision, rule or bye-law which would bring about the result of rendering the system unworkable in practice. It is unfortunate that this principle has not been adequately kept in mind by the High Court while deciding the instant case.”

In the absence of mala fides, proven systemic irregularity or violation of any statutory rule, therefore the direction to undertake re-evaluation with moderation in the lines of **Sanjay Singh vs. U.P.Public Service Commission, Allahabad [(2007) 3 SCC 720]** or to re-conduct Mains examination does not sustain on scrutiny of the materials placed on record.

In a case where the method of evaluation has been uniformly applied in larger public interest, no candidate can be prejudicially affected. The direction of the learned writ court to re-evaluate the Mains examination papers with moderation in the lines of **Sanjay Singh vs. U.P.Public Service Commission, Allahabad [(2007) 3 SCC 720]** also does not sustain on account of the reasons recorded hereinabove based on a detailed analysis of the method of evaluation employed by the Commission and after due consideration of the submissions of the parties on this issue.

The integrity of the examination conducted by a constitutional body, like the Public Service Commission, cannot be made suspect on the basis of surmises and unsubstantiated allegations. The direction of the learned writ court for re-conduct of the examination as an alternative is therefore unsustainable.

Therefore, the impugned common judgment passed in W.P.Nos.11439 of 2025 and batch, dated 09.09.2025 is set aside and the writ appeal Nos.1066, 1054, 1067, 1068, 1069, 1070, 1071, 1072, 1073, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080 and 1086 of 2025 are allowed.

On the basis of the elaborate reasons recorded hereinabove, writ appeal No.1470 of 2025 preferred by the petitioners in W.P.No.12206 of 2025 insisting upon



re-conduct of the Mains examinations, is fit to be dismissed. Accordingly, the writ appeal No.1470 of 2025 is dismissed.

Miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.



THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUDDALA CHALAPATHI RAO

Acts/Rules: Income Tax Act, 1961, Andhra Pradesh Areas Urban Development Act, 1975, etc.

Case Details: The Commissioner of Income-tax (Exemptions), Hyderabad Vs Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority in INCOME TAX TRIBUNAL APPEAL Nos.19 and others of 2019 AND 42 of 2020 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 06-02-2026 (*as per the Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy*)

Facts: The whole dispute revolving around the present batch of appeals pertains to the entitlement of exemption under Section 12A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (for short the 'Act of 1961') so far as the respondent / assessee establishment is concerned.

It is this batch of appeals and the order passed therein by the Tribunal which is under challenge by the Revenue in these batch of 21 appeals.

The Revenue is primarily aggrieved of the registration granted to the assessee under Section 12AA of the Act of 1961 for the period between 2002-2007 when in fact no application for registration was filed by the assessee. The Revenue had also questioned the action of the Tribunal insofar the Tribunal allowing the batch of appeals preferred by the assessee holding the assessee entitled for registration for the period between 2009-2010 onwards.

From the contentions put forth by the assessee, it appears that the whole dispute arises in the light of omission of Section 10(20A) of the Act of 1961 w.e.f. 01.04.2003. Prior to the omission / deletion of this Section from the Act of 1961, the assessee and similarly placed local bodies were entitled for an automatic exemption on account of these local bodies providing services which are charitable in nature and are for general public utility. Subsequent to the deletion of the aforesaid Section, provision of this Section 12AA was required to be availed by such bodies where it was incumbent upon



the assessee to seek for registration under Section 12AA so as to get exemption under Section 11 and 12.

The assessee in the instant case has filed its application for exemption under Section 12AA only on 02.03.2007. Though the application was objected by the Department on the ground of delay, but the Hon'ble Supreme Court had condoned the delay and directed the authorities to consider the application on merits.

Held: The CIT (Exemptions) took note of the fact that Section 12A of the Act of 1961 was brought into force w.e.f. 20.08.1974. This provision dealt with the conditions required for availing the benefits flowing from Sections 11 and 12. Sub-Section (2) of Section 12A was inserted w.e.f. 01.06.2007. Sub-Section (2) and the proviso as it then stood reads as under:

“(2) Where an application has been made on or after the 1st day of June, 2007 the provisions of sections 11 and 12 shall apply in relation to the income of such trust or institution from the assessment year immediately following the financial year in which such application is made

Provided that the provisions of sections 11 and 12 shall apply to a trust or institution where the application is made under-

a) sub-clause (i) of clause (ac) of sub-section (1), from the assessment year from which such trust or institution was earlier granted registration;

(b) sub-clause (iii) of clause (ac) of sub-section (1), from the first of the assessment year for which it was provisionally registered.”

From the aforesaid statutory provision as it then stood, what is clearly evident is that, clause (a) of the proviso to Sub-Section (2) empowered the authorities to grant registration to the trust from the assessment year in which such trust was earlier granted registration. In the instant case also, the assessee had the benefit of exemption under Section 10(20A) of the Act of 1961 since its inception. However, as the said provision i.e. Section 10(20A) stood omitted w.e.f. 01.04.2003 the assessee did not have any exemption and it is only in the year 2007 that it had applied for an appropriate registration under Section 12AA. By the time the said application under Section 12AA was taken up for consideration, Sub-Section (2) of Section 12A(2) already came into force, and in terms of the provisions of Section 12A(2), registration could be granted from an earlier period and it is this which was granted by the authority concerned and which was further extended by the Tribunal for the period beyond 2009-2010 also.



What is necessary to be understood at this juncture is the admitted factual matrix of the case coupled with the fact that the assessee in the instant case is a Government instrumentality. The said civic body has been established with the sole aim, object and purpose of providing as much of facilities to the general public at large.

The authorities of the Income Tax Department have considered the request for registration with a retrospective effect. Because of the fact that firstly it was an instrumentality of the State, secondly it being a civic body, thirdly it is providing services for the public convenience at large; and moreover after the remand proceedings when the matter stood remanded to the authority concerned, the authority concerned was considering the application for registration under Section 12A(2) of the Act of 1961, which already came into force. Thus, the provision of law became applicable to the matters which were already sub-judice based upon which the registration was granted. The Tribunal has also given the backing of judicial precedents of other places also under similar circumstances where such registration was granted. Therefore, the said consideration of the Tribunal so far as granting registration from an earlier date cannot be found fault with as there is ample justification and judicial precedents relied upon by the Tribunal for the same.

Given the aforesaid factual matrix of the case and upon reading the entire order of the Tribunal giving reasons for reaching to the conclusion that has been arrived at based upon judicial precedents and statutory powers which have been conferred upon the authorities granting registration, we do not find any error either on law or on facts committed by the Tribunal while reaching to the said conclusion.

The instant batch of appeals preferred by the Revenue, thus being devoid of merit, deserves to be and are accordingly dismissed.



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

Acts/Rules: The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, etc.

Case Details: Sagar Asia Private Limited Vs Mr. V. Agastya Sagar in WRIT PETITION No.37432 OF 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 12-02-2026 (*per the Hon'ble Justice Moushumi Bhattacharya*)



Facts: The petitioner has assailed an order dated 08.10.2025 passed by a learned Sole Arbitrator dismissing an application (I.A.No.2 of 2025 in A.D.No.14 of 2024) filed by the petitioner under Order I Rule 10(2) of The Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 ('CPC') read with section 16 of The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 ('the Act') seeking discharge from the main Arbitration Case.

The petitioner is the respondent No.3 in the Arbitral proceedings who suffered the impugned order of dismissal. The respondent Nos.1 to 3 in the Writ Petition (including the writ petitioner) are the claimants in the arbitration and partners of the respondent No.6 (Sagar Asia Global LLP). The respondent No.1 initiated Arbitration under the Limited Liability Partnership (LLP) Agreement dated 19.04.2019 for dissolution of the respondent No.6-LLP. The respondent Nos.4 and 5 are the contesting respondents in the arbitral proceedings. The respondent Nos.4 and 5 entered into a Limited Liability Partnership Agreement dated 19.04.2019, the terms of such Agreement were modified by way of Supplement Agreement on 16.05.2019 with the respondent Nos.1 to 3 (claimants).

The primary case of the petitioner before the Arbitral Tribunal was that the petitioner was not a party nor a signatory to the LLP Agreement.

Held: Section 5 of the Act underscores the principle that judicial interference in the arbitral process is antithetical to the scheme of the Act. The entire Act consolidates the autonomy of the parties in choosing to arbitrate and the independence of the Arbitral Tribunal to carry that intention forward. Section 16 is a resounding declaration of the autonomy of the arbitral tribunal to decide upon its jurisdiction.

Thus, arresting the continuity of the Arbitral process by recourse to a route outside the contemplation of the Act would be abhorrent to the statutory scheme. The recent pronouncement of the Supreme Court enabling a party to invoke the writ jurisdiction of a High Court in lieu of the prescribed statutory route, has carved out only a very small window (more of a crack) in the comprehensive armour of the Act. The Supreme Court has clarified that the aperture can only be opened for cases of exceptional rarity or a perversity which is patent.

The present case fails to make the cut under any of the aforesaid parameters. The Arbitral Tribunal has expressed its mind and indicated clear reasons for dismissing the petitioner's challenge to its jurisdiction. The impugned order falls squarely within the realm of the Arbitrator's exclusive zone of decision-making powers under section 16 of the Act. The petitioner's challenge to the impugned order is premature as the Award is yet to be rendered. The petitioner's choice of forum is entirely misplaced as a clear statutory remedy is available under section 16(6) of the Act. That stage has not yet been reached. There is no conceivable reason as to why the Writ Court would impede the momentum of the arbitral proceedings midway. Entertaining such a plea would



set a precarious precedent encouraging similar applications by disgruntled and impatient parties who seek to bypass the statutory framework rather than await the final Award.

We do not find any reason to interfere with or set aside the impugned order passed by the Arbitral Tribunal dated 08.10.2025. The Writ Petition is found to be devoid of merit.

W.P.No.37432 of 2025, along with all connections applications, is accordingly dismissed. No costs.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K. LAKSHMAN

AND

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

Acts/Rules: Indian Penal Code, 1860, etc.

Case Details: Mrs. Banothu Bharathi @ Lasya @ Bujji Vs The State of Telangana in CRIMINAL APPEAL No.547 OF 2025 ALONG WITH REFERRED TRIAL No.2 OF 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 23-01-2026 (*as per the Hon'ble Sri Justice K. Lakshman*)

Facts: Vide judgment dated 07.04.2025 in Sessions Case No.397 of 2022, learned I Additional District and Sessions Judge, Suryapet (hereinafter referred to as 'trial Court'), found the appellant - accused guilty of the offence under Section - 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') and accordingly imposed death penalty on her.

Feeling aggrieved by the aforesaid conviction and death sentence imposed by learned trial Court, the accused preferred Criminal Appeal No.547 of 2025, while learned trial Court addressed a letter vide Dis.No.220 of 2025, dated 07.05.2025 to this Court seeking confirmation of death penalty under Section - 366 (i) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr.P.C.'). Pursuant to the said letter, this Court registered the same as Referred Trial (R.T.) No.2 of 2025.

Held: i) This Court holds that the act resulting in the death of the deceased child is physically attributable to the appellant accused.

ii) However, the evidence on record, assessed on a preponderance of probabilities, establishes that at the time of the occurrence, the appellant - accused was suffering



from such unsoundness of mind as rendered her incapable of knowing the nature of the act and that what she was doing was wrong, contrary to law, thereby attracting the protection of Section - 84 of IPC.

iii) Consequently, though the act is attributable to the appellant - accused, the same does not constitute an offence in the eye of law, and she is entitled to be acquitted by extending the benefit of the General Exception under Section - 84 of IPC to her.

iv) Accordingly, the conviction and sentence imposed in Sessions Case No.397 of 2022 are unsustainable in law and are liable to be set aside.

The present Criminal Appeal is accordingly allowed setting the judgment dated 07.04.2025 in S.C. No.397 of 2022, recording the conviction against the appellant herein - accused and the imposition of death penalty on 11.04.2025 by the learned I Additional District and Sessions Judge at Suryapet. The appellant - accused is acquitted of the aforesaid charge. Bail bonds, if any, furnished by her stand cancelled. Fine amount, if any, paid by the accused is also ordered to be returned to the accused after expiry of appeal time.

Reference is answered accordingly, declining to confirm the death penalty imposed on the appellant - accused by learned trial Court on 11.04.2025 vide judgment dated 07.04.2025 in S.C. No. 397 of 2022.

The Superintendent, Special Prison for Women, Chanchalguda, Hyderabad, is directed to hand over/transfer the accused to the Superintendent, Institute of Mental Health, Erragadda, Hyderabad, forthwith, for safe custody in terms of Section - 335 (1) (a) of Cr.P.C. The Superintendent, Institute of Mental Health, Erragadda, Hyderabad, shall make necessary arrangements for her care and treatment, strictly in accordance with the provisions of Section - 103 of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, under intimation to the District Collector/Magistrate concerned, who in turn shall supervise periodically as contemplated under Chapter - XXV of Cr.P.C., and ensure compliance with statutory safeguards.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous applications, if any, pending in the Criminal Appeal, stand closed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B. VIJAYSEN REDDY

Acts/Rules: Section 22-A of the Registration Act 1908, etc.

Case Details: M/s. Vallabha Estates Pvt. Ltd. **Vs** The State of Telangana **in** WRIT PETITION No.29809 OF 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 29-01-2026

Facts: This writ petition is filed questioning the rejection order Proceedings No.B/381/2025 Court Cases & Intimation Appl. No.CI2500001982 dated 23.08.2025 passed by respondent No.5 - the Revenue Divisional Officer, Rajendranagar, Ranga Reddy District, based on the report of respondent No.6 - the Tahsildar, Gandipet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, as being illegal, arbitrary and in violation of principles of natural justice; and consequently to set aside the rejection order and direct the respondents to de-notify / remove the erroneous status i.e., "court stay / injunction / court order" against the petitioner's land in Survey No.137 (Part) from the prohibitory list and to correct the extent of land as Acs.4-00 guntas, complete the petitioner's KYC and digital signature on the Dharani / Bhu Bharati Portal by updating the revenue records and issue pattadar pass book and title deed to the petitioner.

Held: During the course of hearing, when this Court enquired with the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue as to who is the appropriate authority for notifying or de-notifying the lands as prohibited, he submitted that as per Serial No.7 of Schedule - A of The Telangana Bhu Bharati (Record of Rights in Land) Rules 2025, the District Collector is the competent authority to deal with the grievance of recording or removal of the lands from the prohibitory list. Surprisingly, the impugned order is passed by respondent No.5 based on the report of respondent No.6. According to the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, such order was passed by respondent No.5 pursuant to the directions of this Court by the order dated 24.04.2025 in W.P. No.12252 of 2025. On perusal of the said order, it can be noticed that there is no specific direction to respondent No.5 or respondent No.6 to consider representations of the petitioner for de-notifying the subject land. The writ petition was filed against the State of Telangana through its Principal Secretary (Registration and Stamps) and others. The order dated 24.04.2025 was passed by this Court directing the respondents to dispose of the representations dated 02.01.2025 and 07.04.2025 filed by the petitioner. Thus, it is un-understandable as to how respondent Nos.5 and 6, who are not competent authorities under the Act 2025 and the Rules made thereunder, assumed jurisdiction to consider the representations of the petitioner.



The Bhu Bharati Act came into force with effect from 14.04.2025. The order in W.P. No.12252 of 2025 is dated 24.04.2025. Thus, respondent Nos.5 and 6 did not have jurisdiction to entertain the representations of the petitioner.

For the aforesaid reasons, without going into merits of the case, on the point of lack of jurisdiction of respondent Nos.5 and 6, the writ petition is allowed, at the admission stage itself. The rejection order dated 23.08.2025 passed by respondent No.5 and 6 is set aside. Respondent No.4 is directed to reconsider the applications dated 02.01.2025 and 07.04.2025 of the petitioner by issuing fresh notice to the petitioner and other interested parties and also by affording opportunity of hearing to them and to pass a reasoned order, in accordance with law, within a period of eight (8) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No order as to costs. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous applications, if any, pending in the writ petition stand closed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N. TUKARAMJI

Acts/Rules: Indian Penal Code, 1860, The Essential Commodities Act, 1955, etc.

Case Details: Bheema Bala Krishna and Janumpally Sudharshan and others Vs State of Telangana in CRIMINAL PETITION NOs.11710 and 11675 of 2024 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 25-03-2026.

Facts: The gravamen of the allegations is that the petitioner had allegedly stored 4,495 bags of Custom Milled Rice (CMR) paddy and 410 bags of CMR paddy in excess of the stock reflected in the statutory records maintained by him.

Pursuant to the said allegations, the District Collector (Civil Supplies), Wanaparthy, upon conducting a detailed enquiry under Section 6-A of the EC Act, passed an order dated 12.10.2018 in File No. CS/36/2018. The Collector categorically held that the seized stock constituted valid CMR paddy intended for milling and subsequent supply to the Government and that no contravention of the provisions of the EC Act or the Control Orders was made out. Consequently, the Collector directed redelivery of the seized stock to the petitioner. In compliance with the said order, the petitioner milled the paddy and duly supplied the resultant CMR rice to the Government for the Kharif Marketing Season 2018-2019, thereby fulfilling all contractual and statutory obligations under the procurement scheme.



However, notwithstanding the clear and categorical findings recorded by the competent authority exonerating the petitioner, the police proceeded to file a charge sheet, which culminated in C.C. No. 616 of 2022 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Atmakur.

The petitioner, therefore, contends that continuation of criminal proceedings, despite exoneration in quasi-judicial proceedings under the EC Act, is wholly unsustainable in law and amounts to abuse of process of Court. Accordingly, the petitioner seeks quashment of the said proceedings.

CRL.P. No.11675 of 2024:

The allegation is that the petitioner had stored 3,640 quintals of paddy in excess of the stock recorded in his accounts. The stock was seized, and the matter was referred to the District Collector (Civil Supplies), Wanaparthy, for initiation of proceedings under Section 6-A of the EC Act.

Upon consideration of the material on record, the District Collector, by order dated 12.10.2018, recorded a categorical finding that no contravention or offence had been committed by the petitioner and directed redelivery of the seized paddy.

Subsequently, the petitioner milled the paddy and supplied the CMR rice to the Government for the Kharif Marketing Season 2018-2019 under proper acknowledgment, thereby demonstrating full compliance with the Government procurement scheme. However, disregarding the findings of the competent authority, the police proceeded to file a charge sheet, which resulted in C.C. No. 618 of 2022.

Held: In **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303**, the Apex Court emphasized that criminal law cannot be set in motion where the essential ingredients of the offence are absent. In the Instant case the competent authority has exonerated the petitioners; the seized stock was ordered to be returned; the petitioners complied with the procurement scheme by supplying CMR rice to the Government; and the charge sheet appears to have been filed without due consideration of these crucial findings. In this position, permitting parallel criminal proceedings to continue on identical facts, despite a clear adjudication by the competent authority, would result in contradictory findings and amount to abuse of process of law.

In view of the categorical findings recorded by the District Collector under Section 6-A of the EC Act exonerating the petitioners, and in the absence of any independent material to sustain the allegations, this Court is of the considered opinion that continuation of criminal proceedings is unsustainable.



In effect, the criminal proceedings in C.C. No. 616 of 2022; and C.C. No. 618 of 2022 are hereby quashed. Accordingly, both the Criminal Petitions are allowed. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.



HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA

Acts/Rules: The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, etc.

Case Details: Telangana Small Scale Industries Steel and Wooden Furniture Manufacturers Association **Vs** State of Telangana **in** WRIT PETITION No.38140 OF 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 22-01-2026

Facts: It is the case of the petitioners that the writ petitioners, Telangana Small Scale Industries Steel and Wooden Furniture Small Manufacturers Association and others, have filed the present writ petition challenging the actions of the respondents with respect to the supply of 45,360 bunker beds along with mattresses and pillows. The original tender conditions, as per clause 5 of the tender documents, required the supply to be completed within 120 days from the initial agreement dated 29.05.2025. No supplies were made by Respondents No. 6 and 7 within this period, and instead of retendering after expiry of the 120-day term, a supplementary agreement dated 29.11.2025 was executed, granting an additional 120 days, which contravened the original tender conditions and deprived petitioners of an opportunity to participate.

It is further the case of the petitioners that the reasons cited by the respondents for the delay, include pending color codes for the beds, government enquiries regarding pricing, and verification of space availability in KGBVS, which are unjustified. The tender conditions did not require post-bid determination of color codes. The alleged pricing enquiry was based on irrelevant comparisons, and the space verification should have been completed prior to tendering. No official orders or communications extended the time under the first agreement, making the second agreement arbitrary and beyond the tender terms.

It is further the case of the petitioners that, there was favoritism towards Respondent Nos. 6 to 8, noting that Respondent No. 8 participated actively in the pre-bid meeting, and its credentials were relied upon by Respondent Nos. 6 and 7 to qualify for the tender, thereby enabling multiple participation through the same entity. This arrangement contravenes clause 13(f) of the tender conditions and effectively ensures



preferential treatment for the respondents, undermining fair competition. Additionally, there were irregularities in pricing. Purchase orders dated 04.12.2025 and 05.12.2025 reflected exorbitant rates, including transportation. Post-agreement negotiations and supplemental agreements, including one dated 06.12.2025, were conducted without calling for fresh tenders, contrary to the Central Vigilance Commission guidelines and General Financial Rules that allow renegotiation only in exceptional cases where few suppliers are available. Prior supply records indicate significantly lower costs, reinforcing the petitioners' claim of inflated pricing.

In conclusion, the second supplementary agreements executed on 29.11.2025 materially altered the original tender terms, particularly the 120-day completion period, without proper justification or fresh competitive bidding. These actions were arbitrary, contrary to the tender conditions, show favoritism, and violate established procurement norms, thereby giving them sufficient locus to challenge the proceedings. The writ petitioners have thus sought relief from this Court to ensure adherence to the tender conditions, fair competition, and proper pricing in public procurement.

Held: This Court opines that the petitioners are not entitled for grant of the relief as prayed for in the present writ petition, and the Judgments relied upon by the learned senior designated counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners do not apply to the facts of the present case and accordingly, the pleas put-forth placing reliance on the said judgments are held as untenable and hence, rejected. Accordingly, the interim orders granted by this Court on 11.12.2025 stand vacated, and the writ petition is dismissed, since the same is devoid of merits. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this Writ Petition, shall stand closed.



HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI

Acts/Rules: Constitution of India, etc.

Case Details: CH.Muralidhar Vs The State of Telangana in WRIT PETITION No.6865 of 2026 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 25-03-2026.

Facts: Case of the petitioner is that at the time of admission into B.Tech. (Mechanical Engineering), 1st year in respondent No.4 College, all his original certificates, including SSC Memo, Intermediate Marks Memo, Transfer Certificate, Study and Conduct Certificates, Bonafide certificates of 10th Class and Intermediate and other original certificates, were retained by the Management of respondent No.4-college. He



attended classes for about 15 days. It is the further case of the petitioner that on 21.09.2025, a quarrel occurred wherein seniors attacked him and his friends, resulting in injuries. In connection with the said incident, one senior, namely Sai Teja, committed suicide and a case in Crime No.1152 of 2025 was registered against him. Subsequently, he discontinued his studies and is presently residing with his parents at Nayakangudem Village, Kusumanchi Mandal, Khammam District.

Further case of the petitioner is that he made an application to respondent No.4 seeking return of his original certificates, but he refused to receive his application without any valid reasons and demanded him to pay the entire fee for the remaining three years. Thereafter, he sent another application through RPAD on 04.02.2026 which was received by respondent No.4 on 05.02.2026. However, the same was not considered till date. Hence, the present writ petition.

Held: It is not in dispute that the original certificates of the petitioner referred to above were submitted before respondent No.4 at the time of admission and the petitioner had discontinued his B.Tech course from respondent No.4-college. The said certificates, being personal and academic credentials, are undoubtedly the property of the petitioner. In such circumstances, respondent No.4-college has no authority whatsoever to retain the said certificates and the retention of the petitioner's original certificates by respondent No.4 is wholly unjustified and cannot be sustained. Even assuming that the college has any monetary claim against the petitioner, withholding his original certificates cannot be adopted as a mode of enforcing such claim, the proper remedy, if any available to the college is to proceed in accordance with law for recovery of its dues, but not retain the petitioner's original certificates.

For the foregoing discussion, this Writ Petition is allowed, directing respondent No.4 to forthwith return the original certificates of the petitioner to him. No costs. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V. SHRAVAN KUMAR

Acts/Rules: Constitution of India, etc.

Case Details: Smt. Indumathi Vs The State of Telangana in WRIT PETITION No.2645 of 2026 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 02-02-2026.



Facts: Facts in brief as stated in this writ petition are that respondent No.3 - the Deputy Commissioner, Circle - 41, GHMC, Abids, Hyderabad, issued show cause notice dated 23.12.2025 to petitioner, under the provisions of the GHMC Act, 1955 read with Section 10 of TS-bPASS Act, 2020. The petitioner submitted explanation to the show cause notice on 19.01.2026. The said show cause was issued based on a complaint received from respondent No.5 stating that certain unauthorized constructions are being carried out by the petitioner occupying common area and footpath of premises at Pr.No.Flat No.4, Block No.8, MIG-2, Baghlingampally, Hyderabad, and directed the petitioner to submit explanation to the show cause notice within fifteen (15) days as to why the unauthorized construction should not be demolished departmentally, failing which action will be taken as per Rules in force. A copy of photograph of the unauthorized constructions on the subject property was also forming part of the said show cause notice. The petitioner thereafter filed W.P.No.2022 of 2026 before this Court and this Court vide order dated 22.01.2026 disposed of the writ petition directing respondent No.3 to consider the explanation dated 19.01.2026 submitted by the petitioner to the show cause notice dated 23.12.2025 and pass orders in accordance with law by affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and respondent No.5, and pending enquiry pursuant to the show cause notice dated 23.12.2025, respondent No.3 was directed not to interfere with the possession of the petitioner in respect of the subject property. The order was passed without going into the merits, as such notice to respondent No.5 was dispensed with in that writ petition. By that time the respondent No.3 issued impugned notice dated 20.01.2026. The said orders were issued after considering the reply of the petitioner dated 17.01.2026 and 19.01.2026. In the said order, it was stated that based on a complaint received from respondent No.5 stating that the petitioner has illegally constructed shops by occupying common area and footpath of premises at Pr.No.Flat No.4, Block No.8, MIG-2, Baghlingampally, Hyderabad. A copy of the photograph of the extent of unauthorized construction which is existing in front of the flats was also been appended in the order dated 20.01.2026. In the impugned orders, it is further submitted that the contentions of the petitioner are not correct and does not convey the existing possession on ground, as such, the explanation/reply submitted was rejected, and the petitioner was directed to remove unauthorized constructions within 15 days, failing which the GHMC would proceed to demolish the unauthorized constructions departmentally enforcing recovery of the cost thereof from the petitioner. Questioning the order dated 20.01.2026, the present writ petition is filed.

Held: This Court in **Arvind L. Abhyankar Vs. Municipal Corporation Of Hyderabad [2002 (5) ALD 763]** observed as follows:



“34. The submission of the learned Counsel for the Builder that the impugned action of the Corporation suffers from the vice of laches and delay also cannot be countenanced. It may be true that the officials of the Corporation-despite conducting several inspections during the course of construction of floors 5 to 10, did not raise any objections, but that does not mean that Corporation has given him a green signal to violate the law. The judgment in second appeal made it clear that insofar as future construction is concerned, the Builder shall not contravene the law and he shall not take advantage of the deemed permission. However, the Builder without obtaining permission from the Corporation and without giving notice to the Commissioner about his intention to make construction, as is required under the Act and the extant Bye-laws, constructed floors 5 to 10. That itself is a clear indication that he had violate the law. The Certificate dated 5-1-1989, said to have been issued by the Commissioner of the Corporation, certifying that the constructions made by the Builder are in accordance with the Bye-laws of 1972, is clouded with suspicion for the reason that the Corporation issued a notice to the Builder on 19-4-1994, calling upon him to explain the genesis of the said certificate, and in that regard, it is stated that the Corporation also initiated criminal action against the Builder. Therefore, the Builder cannot claim that the construction of floors 5 to 10 made by him are in accordance with law. As long as the construction continue to remain illegal and unauthorised, the Corporation has every right to initiate action against the Builder for removal of such illegal and unauthorised construction, and time shall not come in the way of the Corporation to take action for removal of such illegal and unauthorised constructions, and more particularly when the statute itself did not prescribe any time limit for initiating such action. Therefore, the contention of the Builder that the action of the Corporation suffers from the vice of delay and laches, is incorrect and cannot be sustained.”

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **M.I. Builders Pvt. Ltd vs Radhey Shyam Sahu And Others (1999 (6) SCC 464)** held that no consideration should be shown to the builder or any other person where construction is unauthorized and further held that the enquiry should be ordered to find out how unauthorized constructions came about . The relevant paragraph Nos.73 and 81 are extracted hereunder:

“High Court has directed dismantling of the whole project and for restoration of the park to its original condition. This Court in numerous decisions has held that no consideration should be shown to the builder or any other person where construction is unauthorised. This dicta is now almost bordering rule of law. Stress was laid by the appellant and the prospective allottees of the shops to



exercise judicial discretion in moulding the relief. Such discretion cannot be exercised which encourages illegality or perpetuates an illegality. Unauthorised construction, if it is illegal and cannot be compounded, has to be demolished. There is no way out. Judicial discretion cannot be guided by expediency. Courts are not free from statutory fetters. Justice is to be rendered in accordance with law. Judges are not entitled to exercise discretion wearing robes of judicial discretion and pass orders based solely on their personal predilections and peculiar dispositions. Judicial discretion wherever it is required to be exercised has to be in accordance with law and set legal principles. As will be seen in moulding the relief in the present case and allowing one of the blocks meant for parking to stand we have been guided by the obligatory duties of the Mahapalika to construct and maintain parking lots.

Number of cases coming to this Court pointing to unauthorised constructions taking place at many places in the country by builders in connivance with the Corporation/Municipal officials. In the series of cases, this Court has directed demolition of unauthorised constructions. This does not appear to have any salutary effect in cases of unauthorised construction coming to this Court. While directing demolition of unauthorised construction, court should also direct inquiry as to how the unauthorised construction came about and to bring the offenders to book. It is not enough to direct demolition of unauthorised construction, where there is clear defiance of law. In the present case, but for the observation of the High Court, we would certainly have directed an inquiry to be made as to how the project was conceived and how the agreement dated November 4, 1993 came to be executed.”

The civic authorities being aware that footpaths are essential public infrastructure for pedestrians, however are not taking immediate steps and it is striking to note that a major portion of the Hyderabad roads lack proper footpaths. Further the civic authorities initiates drive to remove such encroachments only after Court orders or media outrage and the encroachers thereafter quietly return after few weeks. The encroachment control must be routine and not event-based. The citizens, despite paying municipal taxes are deprived of using the footpaths. Similarly, the vehicle owners despite paying road tax are unable to optimally utilize the roads and the civic authorities have continuously ignored the directions of the Hon’ble Courts in dealing with illegal encroachments which are set as an example of bad governance and due to the lapse of appropriate and timely action, illegality perpetuates.

In view of the aforesaid reasons and in the light of the judicial precedents, the impugned order dated 20.01.2026 issued by respondent No.3 warrants no



interference. Since the respondent No.3 had already issued final orders dated 20.01.2026 to the petitioner, shall forthwith take further steps strictly in accordance with law. The writ petition is devoid of merits, fails and is accordingly dismissed insofar as the relief sought by the petitioner.

However, it is made clear that since the photographs filed in the writ petition also shows that there are several encroachments/shops in the said area and upon recording the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner and that the issue is common and for the purpose of implementation of the earlier orders of this Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court and that the entire area is identified as commercial activity area, the above directions will also apply mutatis mutandis to all those persons who have raised unauthorized constructions on the footpath or extensions made to their properties by deviating from the sanctioned building/road plans occupying the footpaths. The respondent authorities are further directed to restore the footpaths to its original condition. Further the respondent No.2 shall cause enquiry on all the erring officers for not complying with the orders of this Court and directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court from time to time and shall identify and remove the unauthorized constructions particularly in the said area and on the streets of Hyderabad and ensure that no further encroachments are permitted.

With the above observations, this writ petition stands disposed of.

The respondent No.2 is directed to file compliance report before the Registry of this Court within a period of three (3) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order stating that the order of this Court and the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court concerning illegal encroachments on footpaths have been implemented in their respective zones. Registry is directed to communicate the order to respondent Nos.1 and 2. Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed. No order as to costs.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE CHADA VIJAYA BHASKAR REDDY

Acts/Rules: Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, etc.

Case Details: M/s. United India Insurance Co. Ltd. Vs Mamilla Jangamma and eight others in MOTOR ACCIDENT CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS APPEAL No.539 of 2019 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))



Date of Judgment: 03-02-2026.

Facts: The brief facts of the case are that on 23.03.2015 at about 7.00 p.m., when the deceased was proceeding on his motorcycle bearing No.AP 29CC 8169 from Nagaram Village towards Ghatkesar, the driver of a DCM vehicle bearing No.AP 37Y 8787, drove the vehicle in a rash and negligent manner, lost control and dashed against the motorcycle. As a result, the deceased sustained grievous injuries and was initially shifted to Raghavendra Hospital, ECIL, Hyderabad and later to Yashoda Hospital, Secunderabad, where he succumbed to the injuries on 24.03.2015 while undergoing treatment. A criminal case was registered in Crime No.81 of 2015 under Section 304-A IPC against the driver of the offending DCM vehicle. Stating that the deceased was aged about 40 years and was engaged in agriculture and hotel business earning Rs.10,000/- per month and that they were entirely dependent on the income of the deceased for their livelihood, the claimants-respondent Nos.1 to 6 herein, being the wife, minor children and parents of the deceased, filed the aforesaid claim petition before the Tribunal claiming compensation of Rs.14,00,000/- for the death of the deceased.

The Tribunal, upon appreciation of oral and documentary evidence, held that the accident occurred due to the rash and negligent driving of the DCM driver and awarded a total compensation of Rs.10,40,405/- with interest at 9% per annum, fastening joint and several liability on the driver, owner and insurer of the offending vehicle. Aggrieved thereby, the present appeal is preferred by the Insurance Company.

Held: So far as driving licence and policy violation is concerned, though the appellant-Insurance Company contended that the driver was not holding a valid licence, no cogent evidence was adduced to establish a fundamental breach of policy conditions. Mere marking of the driving licence extract without examining the concerned licensing authority is insufficient. In any event, the policy was admittedly in force as on the date of accident. Hence, the Tribunal was justified in fastening liability on the insurer.

With regard to quantum of compensation, the Tribunal rightly assessed the income of the deceased at Rs.4,000/- per month, added future prospects as per settled law, applied the appropriate multiplier of 15, and deducted 1/5th towards personal expenses considering six dependents, which is in consonance with the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of **Sarla Verma v. Delhi Transport Corporation [(2009) 6 SCC 121]** and **National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Pranay Sethi [(2017) 16 SCC 680]**.

Coming to the rate of Interest, this Court finds force in the submission of the learned Standing Counsel for the appellant Insurance Company. The Hon'ble Supreme court in



the case of **National Insurance Company Ltd. vs. Mannat Johal and others [AIR 2019 SC 2079]** and in several subsequent decisions held that the reasonable rate of interest to be awarded in motor accident claim cases shall be 7.5% per annum. Therefore, the rate of interest awarded by the Tribunal at 9% per annum is on the higher side and requires modification. Except for the modification in the rate of interest, the award passed by the Tribunal in all other respects is upheld as just and reasonable.

In the result, the appeal is partly allowed by reducing the rate of interest awarded by the Tribunal from 9% per annum to 7.5% per annum from the date of petition till realization. The impugned award passed by the Tribunal is confirmed in all other respects. No order as to costs. As a sequel, the miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.



HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE E.V. VENUGOPAL

Acts/Rules: The Constitution of India, etc.

Case Details: Smt.P.Pallavi. Vs The State of Telangana in WRIT PETITION No.18541 of 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 30.01.2026

Facts: The case of the petitioner, in brief, is that she is the daughter-in-law of respondent Nos.4 and 5 and the legally wedded wife of respondent No.6. Her marriage with respondent No.6 was solemnized on 02.06.2010 as per Hindu rites. It is asserted that after marriage, the petitioner started residing in the matrimonial home bearing H.No.22-2-871, Noor Khan Bazar, Hyderabad, which, according to her, is the ancestral property of respondent Nos.4 to 6 and forms the subject matter of the present dispute. Owing to strained marital relations, respondent Nos.4 and 5 along with respondent No.6 allegedly left the said house in the year 2013 and shifted to the residence of their elder son at Old Bowenpally, leaving the petitioner in possession of the property. Respondent No.6 thereafter filed Divorce O.P.No.97 of 2017 before the Family Court, Hyderabad, which came to be dismissed on 28.01.2020.

(a) It is the petitioner's case that subsequent to the dismissal of the divorce petition, respondent Nos.4 to 6, with mala fide intent to evict her, invoked the provisions of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 (for short 'the Act'). Respondent No.4 filed a complaint under Section 16 of the Act before respondent No.3 alleging forcible occupation by the petitioner from 27.07.2013, suppressing the fact of



her continuous residence since 2010. Basing on such allegations, respondent No.3 passed an order dated 11.04.2025 directing her eviction. The statutory appeal preferred by the petitioner before respondent No.2 was dismissed by order dated 25.06.2025 without, according to the petitioner, due consideration of her pleadings, documents and the findings of the Family Court in the above said Divorce OP. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner has approached this Court.

Held: The law on this issue is well settled. In **Smt.S.Vanitha Vs. Deputy Commissioner [(2021) 15 Supreme Court Cases 730]** and **Satish Chander Ahuja Vs. Sneha Ahuja [(2021) 1 Supreme Court Cases 414]**, the Supreme Court had categorically held that a woman's right to reside under the Domestic Violence Act, 2005 cannot be taken away by using other laws or by giving a narrow meaning to "shared household." The Court clarified that the Senior Citizens Act and the Domestic Violence Act must be read together and in-laws cannot evict a daughter-in-law in a way that defeats her legal right to residence. In **Satish Chander Ahuja Vs. Sneha Ahuja [(2021) 1 Supreme Court Cases 414]** case, the Court further widened the meaning of "shared household," holding that a woman can claim residence even in property owned by her in-laws if it was part of the shared family life. Decisions such as **Vimlaben Ajitbhai Patel Vs. Vatslaben Ashokbhai Patel and others [(2008) 4 SCC 649]** and **Vinay Varma Vs. Kanika Pasricha and another [SCC OnLine Delhi 1530]** also make it clear that a woman cannot be left homeless merely due to technical ownership claims. In **B.P.Achala Anand Vs. S.Appi Reddy and another [(2005) 3 SCC 313]** it is categorically held that a deserted wife has a right to residence in the matrimonial home as part of her right to maintenance. Taken together, these rulings strongly support the petitioner's right to residence and protection under the Domestic Violence Act, which cannot be arbitrarily taken away through eviction or property disputes.

Section 23 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 applies only where a senior citizen has transferred property subject to the condition that the transferee will maintain them and such condition is later breached. In the present facts, there is no such conditional transfer of property in favour of the daughter-in-law or the husband that is alleged to have been violated. Therefore, Section 23 is not attracted and Section 23 cannot be used as a tool to evict a daughter-in-law from a shared household when she claims a statutory right of residence under the Domestic Violence Act. As held by the Supreme Court in **Smt.S.Vanitha Vs. Deputy Commissioner [(2021) 15 Supreme Court Cases 730]**, the Senior Citizens Act and the Domestic Violence Act must be read harmoniously and eviction orders under the former cannot nullify residence rights under the latter. In the light of the above facts and circumstances and settled proposition of law, Section 23 of the Senior Citizens Act is inapplicable to the present case, and no eviction can be sustained under it, especially



when it would defeat the petitioner's lawful right of residence under the Domestic Violence Act.

Moreover, it is not the case of respondents that the subject property is their only property or that they have been compelled to reside in rented accommodation due to the petitioner's occupation of the subject property. Further, it is not the case of the respondents that they are in bona fide requirement of the schedule premises. The record further reflects that, although the petitioner is living separately from her husband, she has not initiated any criminal proceedings against her husband or her in-laws. This circumstance indicates that no allegations of criminal conduct have been raised by the petitioner against them. It is an admitted position that no proceedings under the provisions relating to domestic violence or Section 498A of IPC have been initiated by the petitioner against her husband or her in-laws. In the absence of any such proceedings or material on record, no inference can be drawn that the petitioner subjected her in-laws, who are senior citizens, to mental or physical harassment or that she attempted to unlawfully appropriate their property.

As seen from the record, the partition deed, relied upon by the petitioner, shows that the subject property was devolved upon the father-in-law of the petitioner in a family partition. In such a case, the property can be treated as ancestral property of the respondents, in which, the husband of the petitioner will certainly have a share and since the petitioner is not legally separated from her husband, she can claim right of residence in the subject property.

In these circumstances, this Court is satisfied that the invocation of the Senior Citizens Act by respondent Nos.4 to 6 amounts to a colourable exercise of power, intended to achieve indirectly what could not be achieved in matrimonial proceedings. Such use of a summary welfare legislation to dispossess the petitioner of her matrimonial home is impermissible in law.

Accordingly, the order dated 21.06.2025 passed by respondent No.2, confirming the order dated 11.04.2025 passed by respondent No.3, is liable to be set aside. In the result, the writ petition is allowed. As a sequel, the miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAGESH BHEEMAPAKA

Acts/Rules: The Limitation Act, etc.

Case Details: Rishi Kanth Naresh Betha. **Vs** The Secunderabad Cantonment Board in WRIT PETITION No. 35604 OF 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 25.02.2026.

Facts: It is the case of Petitioner that he is the owner of H. No. 2-6-7/8, admeasuring 65.55 Sq. Yards or 54.34 Sq. Meters situated at Sikh Village, Secunderabad Cantonment, Telangana having inherited the same from his father Betha Mallesh, who expired on 20.06.2015. The said Mallesh purchased the same from Ganta Sangeetha, wife of Ganta Rana Prakash Yadav by virtue of a registered Sale Deed dated 19.09.2002 bearing document No. 1425 of 2002 of the office of Sub Registrar, Bowenpally.

It is the further case of petitioner that in 1992, their predecessor-in-title viz. Ganta Sangeetha filed O.S. No. 1182 of 1992 on the file of the I Assistant Judge, City Civil Courts, Secunderabad against the father of the Respondent No. 2 by name Capt. Ramalingam, seeking perpetual injunction contending that he is interfering with the ingress and egress from the 15 feet public road. The father of Respondent No. 2, being the sole Defendant in the aforesaid suit, had taken an identical stand as taken by Respondent No. 2 in the present proceedings and contended that the passage in question was a private passage which was being used by them for cleaning the septic tank. The Civil Court had framed an issue as to whether the suit property is a public passage and plaintiff is entitled for perpetual injunction as prayed for?

It is further contended that civil Court had answered the issue in the affirmative and held as follows:

"... I therefore conclude on this issue the suit property is a public passage and the Plaintiff and the general public will have got right of access through this passage..."

Aggrieved by the Judgment and Decree in the above suit, A.S.No. 141 of 1997 was preferred by the father/predecessor-in-title of Respondent No. 2 namely Capt. Ramalingam before the I Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Courts at Secunderabad and the same was also dismissed on 05.09.2003. Petitioner contended that despite the Order of injunction, Respondent No. 2 made constructions without any permission on the public passage/road. Petitioner therefore, is stated to have submitted representations to Respondent No. 1 on 22.02.2025, 03.05.2025 and 03.10.2025 complaining of the illegal acts of Respondent No. 2, who, in order to circumvent his illegal acts, filed Writ Petition No. 6231 of 2025 with a false and baseless prayer by



suppressing all these facts, and is trying to re-agitate the issue which has already been settled by the Civil Court.

Held: Petitioner has shown existence of a legal right i.e. existence of a public lane declared by the civil Court and confirmed in Appeal, non-performance of a statutory duty, which is evident from the photographs, which clearly show that lane has been encroached and ingress and egress is being restricted, has sensitized the authorities by giving representations dated 20.02.2025, 03.03.2025 and 30.10.2025 clearly stating the facts aforementioned and Respondent No. 1 Board has, admittedly, not taken any action on the said representations. Learned Standing Counsel for Respondent No. 1 has fairly contended that it would abide by the decision rendered by the civil Court and would take all necessary actions to ensure that encroachment in public lane is removed and further ensured that there is no obstruction/hindrance in the ingress and egress from the public lane. Therefore, this Court holds that Petitioner made out a clear case for grant of mandamus.

Roads, public streets, lanes etc., are not matters of private convenience but the very arteries of urban life, dedicated to the use of public at large. They exist to secure safe and unobstructed movement for all persons, including children, senior citizens and persons with disabilities, whose ability to access the city with safety and dignity is now recognized as an incident of the right to life under Article 21. No individual, however placed, can assert a legally enforceable claim to encroach upon, appropriate or otherwise obstruct these ways for private benefit. Any such act is, in substance, a trespass upon public property and is liable to be removed in accordance with law.

These spaces are held by the State and local authorities in trust for the community, and the public trust doctrine obliges them to use and regulate such property only for public purposes and in furtherance of fundamental rights. It is, therefore, a constitutional as well as statutory duty of these authorities to ensure that public streets and footpaths are kept free from obstruction and encroachment, so that the guarantees under Articles 14 and 21 equality before the law, meaningful mobility, personal safety and right to live with dignity should not remain a mere statement of principle but must be ensured and realized in the daily life of every citizen.

In view of the above, Respondent No. 1 is obligated to protect the public lane in question and ensure that the same is free from all encroachments and that general public have a free and unfettered right of access and usage in respect of the said public lane.



The Writ Petition is therefore allowed, directing Respondent No. 1 to ensure that 15 feet public lane as declared by the Judgment and Decree in O.S. No. 1182 of 1992, dated 11.08.1997 on the file of the I Assistant Judge, City Civil Courts, Secunderabad as confirmed in A.S. No. 141 of 1997 by the I Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Courts at Secunderabad dated 05.09.2003 is free from all encroachments and further ensure that ingress and egress to the said public lane is not restricted or obstructed in any manner. The entire exercise shall be completed within four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, the miscellaneous Applications, if any shall stand closed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K. SARATH

Acts/Rules: The Constitution of India, etc

Case Details: Mannem Jhansi. **Vs** The State of Telangana **in** WRIT PETITION No.30845 of 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 06.03.2026.

Facts: This writ petition is filed questioning the action of the respondent No.2 in not including the petitioner's name in the selection list under Economically Weaker Section quota in pursuance to the Group-I Notification vide Notification No.2/2024 dated 19.02.2024 and inclusion less meritorious candidates as illegal and arbitrary and declare that the petitioner is entitled to be selected and appointed to the posts in one of the Grade-I service based on her merit/rank/marks as an E.W.S candidate.

Held: The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Bedanga Talukdar Vs. Saifudaulla Khan and others [(2011) 12 SCC 85]**, held as under:

"29. We have considered the entire matter in detail. In our opinion, it is too well settled to need any further reiteration that all appointments to public office have to be made in conformity with Article 14 of the Constitution of India. In other words, there must be no arbitrariness resulting from any undue favour being shown to any candidate. Therefore, the selection process has to be conducted strictly in accordance with the stipulated selection procedure.

Consequently, when a particular schedule is mentioned in an advertisement, the same has to be scrupulously maintained. There can not be any relaxation in the



terms and conditions of the advertisement unless such a power is specifically reserved. Such a power could be reserved in the relevant Statutory Rules. Even if power of relaxation is provided in the rules, it must still be mentioned in the advertisement. In the absence of such power in the Rules, it could still be provided in the advertisement. However, the power of relaxation, if exercised has to be given due publicity. This would be necessary to ensure that those candidates who become eligible due to the relaxation, are afforded an equal opportunity to apply and compete. Relaxation of any condition in advertisement without due publication would be contrary to the mandate of quality contained in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

Xxxx

Xxxx

32. In the face of such conclusions, we have little hesitation in concluding that the conclusion recorded by the High Court is contrary to the facts and materials on the record. It is settled law that there can be no relaxation in the terms and conditions contained in the advertisement unless the power of relaxation is duly reserved in the relevant rules and/or in the advertisement. Even if there is a power of relaxation in the rules, the same would still have to be specifically indicated in the advertisement. In the present case, no such rule has been brought to our notice. In such circumstances, the High Court could not have issued the impugned direction to consider the claim of respondent No.1 on the basis of identity card submitted after the selection process was over, with the publication of the select list”

(Emphasis added)

In another similar case, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in **State of Bihar and other Vs., Madhu Kant Ranjan and another [(2021) 17 SCC 141]** held that a candidate has to comply with all the conditions as per the Notification before the cut-off date. The relevant portion of the said Judgment is extracted as under:

“11. As per the settled proposition of law, a candidate/applicant has to comply with all the conditions/eligibility criteria as per the advertisement before the cut-off date mentioned therein unless extended by the recruiting authority. Also, only those documents, which are submitted alongwith the application form, which are required to be submitted as per the advertisement have to be considered. Therefore, when the respondent No.1 – original writ petitioner did not produce the photocopy of the NCC ‘B’ certificate alongwith the original



application as per the advertisement and the same was submitted after a period of three years from the cut-off date and that too after the physical test, he was not entitled to the additional five marks of the NCC 'B' certificate. In these circumstances, the Division Bench of the High Court has erred in directing the appellants to appoint the respondent No.1 – original writ petitioner on the post of Constable considering the select list dated 08.09.2007 and allotting five additional marks of NCC 'B' certificate”

The finding of the above Judgments squarely apply to the facts of the instant case, as the petitioner failed to comply the conditions mentioned in Para No.7.2 (b) of the impugned Notification and the petitioner not having the EWS certificate at the time of submission of application and obtained subsequently and submitted at the time of certificate verification. In view of the same, the petitioner has no right to claim for consideration of her candidature under EWS category. The respondent No.2 has rightly rejected the claim of the petitioner for consideration of her candidature under EWS quota and there are no merits and the writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

In view of the above finding, this writ petition is dismissed as devoid of merits.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE J. SREENIVAS RAO

Acts/Rules: Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, etc

Case Details: Sekhar Kumar **Vs** The State of Telangana **in** CRIMINAL PETITION No. 785 of 2026 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 13.03.2026.

Facts: On 01.06.2024, respondent No.2/de-facto complainant lodged a complaint before Chaitanyapuri Police Station, Rachakonda Commissionerate, stating that the petitioner was acquainted with her family since 2013 and he earned the family's blind trust by posing as a father figure and issued her an Army Dependent Card listing himself as her father and facilitated her B.Sc. Biotechnology admission in Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, in June 2019, when she was 17 years old. The petitioner gave her shelter in his Delhi Cantonment military quarter, from July 2019, and he began vulgar advances, forced her to remove the towel after bath and tucked her uniform shirt inappropriately despite resistance. On 06.09.2019, and subsequent nights, drugged her dinner to render her semi-conscious before sexually assaulting her multiple times by undressing her, touching and orally assaulting her private parts and attempting penetration. After confronting and relocating within the quarter, she returned to



Hyderabad in October 2019 and visited Delhi only to attend exams. After completing her graduation, while staying in a hostel, informed her parents about similar assaults committed by the petitioner on her younger sister and he continued to visit their residence in Hyderabad on about four to five occasions post COVID. During his stay beginning from 21.05.2024, the petitioner allegedly groped her including her private parts. On 24.05.2024 and 25.05.2024, the same was repeated while driving back from a military canteen and after a driving licence test. When confronted by the family, the petitioner allegedly threatened reputational harm by branding her as a characterless girl. The matter was reported to the petitioner's Commanding Officer on 26.05.2024, who advised that the petitioner would be allowed to return to his unit. Basing upon the said complaint, Crime No. 416 of 2024 has been registered for the aforementioned offences.

Held: It is relevant to mention that in **Shreekant Sharma v. State of West Bengal & Anr. [2023 SCC OnLine Cal 1961]**, the High Court of Calcutta held that the delay in reporting sexual offences cannot by itself be a ground to quash the proceedings, placing reliance on the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Satpal Singh v. State of Haryana [(2010) 8 SCC 714]**, and **State of Himachal Pradesh v. Prem Singh [AIR 2009 SC 1010]**, wherein it was held that delay in lodging F.I.R. in sexual offences is not uncommon due to trauma, stigma and social pressures faced by the victim and her family. The Court also relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Tulsidas Kanolkar v. State of Goa [(2003) 8 SCC 590]**, wherein it was held that the delay in reporting rape or sexual assault cannot be used as a ritualistic formula to discard the prosecution case and the explanation for such delay must be considered in the surrounding circumstances. Applying the principles governing exercise of inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. as laid down in **State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal [1992 Supp (1) SCC 335]**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the allegations in the F.I.R. disclosed prima facie commission of cognizable offences and did not fall within any of the categories warranting quashing of criminal proceedings. Consequently, the criminal revision petitions were dismissed.

In the present case, there are specific allegations levelled in the complaint against the petitioner from March, 2019 to 21.05.2024 and that complaint discloses that the petitioner was a long-time family acquaintance and had gained the trust of the family of respondent No.2 since her minority. The allegations indicate that the accused had provided shelter to respondent No.2 during her studies and allegedly committed acts of sexual assault during that period and on subsequent occasions, by threatening reputational harm when confronted. Having regard to such circumstances, including the relationship of trust and alleged intimidation by the petitioner, the delay in lodging the complaint cannot be said to be unnatural or fatal to the prosecution case at this stage.



It is also relevant to mention that in **Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Maharashtra [(2021) 19 SCC 401]**, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that the power of quashing should be exercised sparingly and with great circumspection, that the police have a statutory right and duty to investigate cognizable offences, and that ordinarily courts should not interfere at the stage of investigation unless the F.I.R., on a plain reading, fails to disclose the commission of any cognizable offence. It was further observed that the Court cannot conduct a meticulous examination of the truthfulness of the allegations at the threshold and criminal proceedings should not be scuttled at the nascent stage.

Insofar as the other submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation and he will produce the documents, which are in his possession, and requested this Court to grant necessary protection and direct the Investigation Officer not to take any coercive steps against the petitioner is concerned, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. supra and Sanjay Kumar Gupta v. State of U.P. [2025 LiveLaw (SC) 1170]**, held that the Court cannot grant a blanket order of "no coercive steps" or "not to arrest", as such protection is in the nature of anticipatory bail, which must be sought before the competent Court under Section 438 Cr.P.C., and granting such relief while refusing to quash the F.I.R. is wholly impermissible. In view of the said principles laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, this Court is not inclined to grant the relief of protection as sought by the learned counsel for the petitioner in the present case, especially the allegations levelled against the petitioner are heinous in nature.

For the foregoing reasons as well as the precedent decisions, this Court does not find any ground to quash the proceedings in F.I.R. No.416 of 2024 of Chaitanyapuri Police Station, Rachakonda, while exercising the powers conferred under the provisions of Section 528 of the BNSS, especially the investigation is under progress.

Accordingly, the criminal petition is dismissed. However, it is made clear that any of the observations made in this order are confined for the purpose of deciding this case only. Miscellaneous applications, pending if any, shall stand closed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAMAVARAPU RAJESHWAR RAO

Acts/Rules: The Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, etc

Case Details: APSRTC, Musheerabad and another. Vs M.Pochaiah and others. in WRIT PETITION No.31689 of 2010 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))



Date of Judgment: 16-03-2026.

Facts: (a) The petitioners' Corporation has entrusted the works of sweeping and cleaning the bus station to the Contractor on a contract basis by way of calling tenders, and that the 1st respondent was engaged by the Contractor and was allotted the work of night watchman-cum-sweeper. The 1st respondent's services were utilized at Siddipet bus station to sweep buses arriving at the said bus station, and to sweep the entire bus station. He attended the duty from 6.00 a.m. to 5 p.m. and also worked in the 2nd petitioner's office. The 1st respondent was not an employee of the petitioners' Corporation. The name of the 1st respondent was not found in the salary bill of employees of Siddipet Depot, and he did not have any staff number allotted by the petitioners' Corporation. The 2nd petitioner orally terminated the 1st respondent from service w.e.f. 01.11.1992.

(b) The 1st respondent submitted a representation to the Hon'ble Minister for Labour and Employment, Government of India requesting to regularize his services and the Hon'ble Minister gave reply on 05.06.2006 stating that his services cannot be regularized as he was not appointed by the petitioners' Corporation and he worked under a contractor maintaining the works of sweeping and cleaning at Old Bus Station, Siddipet. Questioning the same, the 1st respondent filed I.D.No.67 of 2006, and the Labour Court, vide Award dated 30.06.2010, while setting aside the removal order dated 01.11.1992, directed the petitioners' Corporation to reinstate the 1st respondent into service, but without back wages and continuity of service. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioners' Corporation filed the present writ petition.

Held: Under beneficial legislation, in cases of this nature, the Labour Court may award some compensation based on the wages drawn by the 1st respondent. However, no material is available on record regarding the wages paid to the 1st respondent during his employment.

In the present case, the 1st respondent has expired, and his legal representatives have been brought on record as respondent Nos.3 to 5. Therefore, at this stage, the question of reinstatement and continuity of service does not arise. However, considering the fact that the 1st respondent worked as a daily wage employee for a period of about 270 days, this Court deems it appropriate to grant some compensation to the legal representatives of the 1st respondent. However, there is no information on record regarding the salary the 1st respondent received during his employment as a daily wage worker.

With regard to reinstatement and back wages, the Apex Court in **BHARAT SANCHAR NIGAM LIMITED Vs. BHURUMAL [(2014) 7 SSC 177]**, held as follows :-



“The ordinary principle of grant of reinstatement with full back wages, when the termination is found to be illegal is not applied mechanically in all cases. While that may be a position where services of a regular/permanent workman are terminated illegally and/or mala fide and/or by way of victimisation, unfair labour practice, etc. However, when it comes to the case of termination of a daily-wage worker and where the termination is found illegal because of a procedural defect, namely, in violation of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 the Supreme Court is consistent in taking the view that in such cases reinstatement with back wages is not automatic and instead the workman should be given monetary compensation which will meet the ends of justice. Rationale, for shifting in this direction is obvious.

The reasons for denying the relief of reinstatement in such cases are obvious. It is trite law that when the termination is found to be illegal because of non-payment of retrenchment compensation and notice pay as mandatorily required under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, even after reinstatement, it is always open to the management to terminate the services of that employee by paying him the retrenchment compensation. Since such a workman was working on daily-wage basis and even after he is reinstated, he has no right to seek regularisation. Thus when he cannot claim regularisation and he has no right to continue even as a daily-wage worker, no useful purpose is going to be served in reinstating such a workman and he can be given monetary compensation by the Court itself inasmuch as if he is terminated again after reinstatement, he would receive monetary compensation only in the form of retrenchment compensation and notice pay. In such a situation, giving the relief of reinstatement, that too a after a long gap, would not serve any purpose.

Therefore, this fact becomes relevant when it comes to giving the relief. Judicial notice can also be taken of the fact that the need of linemen in the Telephone Department has been drastically reduced after the advancement of a technology. For all these reasons, we are of the view that ends of justice would be met by granting compensation in lieu of reinstatement.

37. In Man Singh [Civil Appeal No.2974 of 2016, dated 11.09.2025] which was also a case of BSNL, this Court had granted compensation of Rs.2 lakhs to each of the workmen when they had worked for merely 240 days. Since the respondent herein worked for longer period, we are of the view that he should be paid a compensation of Rs.3 lakhs. This compensation should be paid within



2 months failing which the respondent shall also be entitled to interest at the rate of 12% per annum from the date of this judgment.”

In view of the foregoing discussion and in view of the dictum laid down in BHARAT SANCHAR NIGAM's case, the impugned Award is liable to be set aside, and it is accordingly set aside. However, the petitioners are directed to pay compensation of Rs.30,000/- (Rupees thirty thousand only) to the legal representatives of the 1st respondent i.e., respondent Nos.3 to 5, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs. Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE LAXMINARAYANA ALISHETTY

Acts/Rules: A.P. Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971, etc

Case Details: Kolan Rukka Reddy and nine others Vs The State of Telangana in WRIT PETITION Nos.10920 and others of 2020 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 29-01-2026

Facts: Writ Petition No.10920 of 2020 is filed to issue a writ of Mandamus declaring Form-I notice bearing No.B/361/2019, dated 10.07.2020, issued by respondent No.4, at the instance of respondent Nos.1 to 3, as illegal and arbitrary.

Writ Petition No.11110 of 2020 is filed to issue a writ of Mandamus declaring Form-II notice bearing No.B/361/2019, dated 10.07.2020, issued by respondent No.4, at the instance of respondent Nos.1 to 3, as illegal and arbitrary.

Writ Petition No.11897 of 2020 is filed to issue a writ of Mandamus declaring the order, vide proceedings No.B/77/2020, dated 09.07.2020, passed by respondent No.3, confirming the order, vide proceedings No.B/3854/2015, dated 07.01.2016, passed by the then Deputy Collector & Tahsildar, Quthbullapur Mandal (presently Bachupally Mandal), Medchal District, as illegal, null and void and consequently, to the set aside the same.



Since the parties, subject matter and the issues involved in all the three Writ Petitions is one and the same, they are heard together and are being disposed of by common order.

For convenience, Writ Petition No.11897 of 2020 is taken up as a lead case and the facts stated therein, which are almost similar in the other Writ Petitions, are narrated.

Held: In the instant case, the specific case of the petitioners is that the subject land was allotted to them on payment of Rs.201-72 paise for an extent of Acs.4.18 guntas. In proof of the said stand, photostat copies of the challans were also produced before this Court. The respondents, except taking a stand that the subject land is assigned land and the said assignment is subject to condition of non-alienation, have failed to discharge the initial burden of proving their stand by producing relevant evidence in that regard to enable them to initiate resumption proceedings. In fact, in the impugned order, it is specifically observed that the assignment deed is not traceable in the office, therefore, in the absence of any material that the subject lands are assigned to the petitioners subject to condition of non-alienation, the impugned proceedings are without any jurisdiction and authority and therefore, the same are unsustainable and are liable to be set aside.

For the foregoing reasons, all the Writ Petitions are allowed and consequently, the impugned order dated 09.07.2020, in proceedings No.B/77/2020 passed by respondent No.3 and the notices in Forms-I & II, bearing No.B/361/2019, dated 10.07.2020, issued by respondent No.4, are declared as null and void and are, accordingly, set aside. Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, in this writ petition shall stand closed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR JUKANTI

Acts/Rules: Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, etc

Case Details: Mr.A.K.Gupta Vs The Union of India in CRIMINAL PETITION No.7334 of 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 25.03.2026.

Facts: Complaint came to be filed in the month of March, 2012 under Section 200 of Cr.P.C., read with Section 32(1) of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, for an offence under Section 16 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 punishable under Section 27



of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, (for short 'Act, 1940') in the Court of XI Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, City Criminal Courts at Secunderabad.

In the complaint (annexed at Page No.5) place of offence is shown as Central Hospital, South Central Railway, Lalaguda, Secunderabad (referred to as 'Hospital'). The complainant– respondent drew sample along with CBI officials on 14.05.2010 from the premises of hospital, as per the Act and Rules, in Form 17A with Sample No. PBN/AP-SZ/36-10.

Samples were forwarded to Government Analyst to Central Drugs Laboratory, Kolkata, in Form 18 vide memorandum No.6-2(1)/Sub Zone/2010/733, dated 21.05.2010 for test analysis. Test report was received in Form 13 from Government Analyst on 16.08.2010 for the sample of Roxythromycin Tablets I.P. (Indian Pharma Copoeia) 150 mg bearing Batch No. H-8462T, declared as 'Not of standard quality', as sample did not confirm to I.P. with respect to dissolution.

A show cause notice dated 30.08.2010 was issued to hospital for disclosing the sale particulars of drug, and further a direction was issued not to use the subject batch of drug, a copy of the original test report was given to the hospital.

On the basis of the complaint received, the XI Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, City Criminal Courts, committed the case to concerned Court, i.e., I Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge, Hyderabad at Nampally Courts. On the basis of contents of complaint and the material, case was numbered as Special S.C. No.03 of 2019 (on the file of the I Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge, Hyderabad at Nampally).

Petitioner/accused No.1 herein filed this petition under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS, 2023'). Learned counsel for petitioner/accused No.1 submitted that sample of drug, Roxythromycin 150 mg bearing Batch No.H-8462T, was drawn from the hospital on 14.05.2010, that the drug was manufactured in March, 2009 and petitioner retired on 31.01.2009.

It is submitted that the petitioner was a Zonal Manager in Hindustan Antibiotics Limited at the particular point of time. It is the specific case of petitioner that petitioner/accused No.1 was not in charge of day-to-day affairs of company at the time of manufacture of drug, and that one Preeth International Private Limited was drug manufacturer who supplied the drug.



It is not in dispute that petitioner retired from company on 31.01.2009, that the drug was manufactured in the month of March, 2009, after retirement of petitioner/accused No.1 by Preeth International Private Limited, which is arrayed as an accused in SPL S.C. No.03 of 2019.

It is the case of complainant-respondent that all the accused, i.e., accused Nos.1 to 3, have contravened Section 16 of Act, 1940, punishable under Section 27 of Act, 1940, and that offences committed by accused Nos.1 to 3 occurred at Hyderabad. Hence, complaint.

When the petition came up on earlier occasion, Court queried the counsel for complainant-respondent as to how petitioner was arrayed as an accused when it was not disputed that he retired from service on 31.01.2009 and that the drug was manufactured in the month of March, 2009 and as to how petitioner/accused No.1 could be mulcted for not maintaining the standard quality of Roxythromycin tablets I.P 150 mg bearing Batch No. H-8462T.

Held: It is trite to extract the relevant portion of the investigation report (at paragraph No.13) placed on record:

“...The firm has not produced the documents pertaining to the role and responsibilities of Mr.A.K.Gupta. Further, the firm has stated that Mr.G.Rajendran, Divisional Manager I/C (South Zone) was responsible person for day-to-day business activities of the firm after retirement of Mr.A.K.Gupta on 31.01.2009. (Declaration submitted by the firm is attached as Annexure-III).”

On a perusal of the relevant portion of the report, it is apparent that petitioner/accused No.1 has no role and responsibility in the entire episode.

Submissions are made that present incumbent officers are in no way responsible in naming the petitioner/accused No.1 in the complaint. This Court is conscious of the fact that they are not part of the acts in setting the criminal law into motion against petitioner/accused No.1.

The allegations and offences alleged against the petitioner/accused No.1 under Section 16 of the Act, 1940, punishable under Section 27 read with Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945, were wholly illegal and contrary to the facts on record. Therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to set aside the proceedings and allow the criminal petition filed herein under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023.



Having considered the material on record and the contentions advanced, this Court deems it to be a fit case to impose costs on respondent authorities to secure the ends of justice. The Hon'ble Apex Court, while dealing with the aspect of imposition of costs in exercise of inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure (Section 528 of BNSS, 2023), in **Mary Angel and Others v. State of Tamil Nadu [(1999) 5 SCC 209]** at paragraph No.8, held as follows:

"In our view, Section 482 Cr.PC stands independently from the other provisions of the Code and it expressly saves the inherent powers of the High Court by providing that: "482. Nothing in this Code shall be deemed to limit or affect the inherent powers of the High Court to make such orders as may be necessary to give effect to any order under this Code, or to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice."

Therefore, to prevent abuse of the process of the court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice the High Court is empowered to pass "such order" which may include order to pay costs to the informant (complainant) and the language of the section does not in terms place any fetter. This power is not conditioned or controlled by any other section nor is curtailed by any provisions which empower the court to award costs. No doubt, this jurisdiction is of an exceptional nature and is to be exercised in exceptional cases for achieving the purposes stated in the section. Secondly, costs could be either for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the litigation as it can be exemplary to prevent the abuse of the process of the court or to secure the ends of justice or giving effect to any order passed under the Code."

The Hon'ble Apex Court further held at paragraph No.22 as follows:

"In the result, we hold that while exercising inherent jurisdiction under Section 482, the Court has power to pass "such orders" (not inconsistent with any provision of the Code) including the order for costs in appropriate cases

- (i) to give effect to any order passed under the Code, or*
- (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court, or*
- (iii) otherwise to secure the ends of justice.*

As stated above, this extraordinary power is to be used in extraordinary circumstances and in a judicious manner. Costs may be to meet the litigation expenses or can be exemplary to achieve the aforesaid purposes."

This Court has no hesitation to hold that there has been an abuse of process of Court and injustice is meted out to petitioner/accused No.1. Criminal law is set into motion, without any basis against the petitioner/accused No.1. The respondent authorities are



directed to pay costs of Rs.50,000/- to meet the litigation expenses of the petitioner/accused No.1. The amounts shall be paid within a period of four (04) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

For reasons aforesaid, the Criminal Petition stands allowed and the proceedings against the petitioner/accused No.1 in Spl.S.C.No.03 of 2019 on the file of the 1st Addl. Metropolitan Sessions Judge, Hyderabad, at Nampally, are liable to be quashed and accordingly quashed.



HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE SUJANA KALASIKAM

Acts/Rules: IPC, Information Technology Act, etc

Case Details: Selvam Ramraj Vs The State of Telangana in CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.199 of 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 02-03-2026.

Facts: The brief facts of the case are that the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), ACB, Hyderabad registered a case in RC. No.01(A)/2020 alleging that accused Nos.1 to 5 entered into a criminal conspiracy to impersonate senior Government of India officials by spoofing official telephone numbers of the CBI and the Ministry of Home Affairs. It was alleged that, by such impersonation, they attempted to extort huge sums of money from persons facing investigation, including Shri Rayapati Sambasiva Rao, Chairman of M/s. Transtroy (India) Ltd., by promising favourable outcomes in pending CBI cases. After completion of investigation, a charge sheet was filed for offences under Sections 120-B read with Sections 419, 420 read with 511 IPC and Section 66-D of the Information Technology Act. Cognizance was taken and the case was registered as C.C.No.6061 of 2024, wherein the petitioner was arrayed as Accused No.2.

Thereafter, the petitioner filed discharge petition before the trial Court under Section 239 Cr.P.C., contending that he had no role in the alleged conspiracy and that the charge sheet did not disclose any grave suspicion against him. He submitted that the allegations primarily concerned accused Nos.4 and 5 and that he was not aware of the true identity of accused No.5, who impersonated senior government officials. It was argued that mere WhatsApp communications and association with co-accused do not establish mens rea or a prior agreement necessary to constitute criminal conspiracy. The petitioner further contended that even if the entire charge sheet is accepted as



true, the essential ingredients of offences under Sections 120-B, 419, 420 read with 511 IPC and Section 66-D of the IT Act are not attracted, and therefore continuation of the proceedings would amount to abuse of process of law.

The prosecution before the trial Court opposed the petition contending that the petitioner was an active conspirator who played a crucial role in facilitating the extortion scheme. It was submitted that the petitioner introduced accused No.1 to accused No.5 and coordinated communications between them, fully aware that money was being demanded by impersonating CBI and MHA officials. The prosecution relied upon WhatsApp chats, telephonic surveillance, hotel bookings, and statements of witnesses to establish the petitioner's involvement and mens rea. It was argued that at the stage of discharge, the Court was only required to see whether a prima facie case existed and not to conduct a mini-trial and that sufficient material is available to proceed against the petitioner.

After hearing both sides, the trial Court examined the scope of Section 239 Cr.P.C., vide order dated 24.01.2025 and dismissed the petition holding that discharge could be granted only when the charge was found to be groundless. Upon perusal of the charge sheet and accompanying material, the trial Court observed that there was prima facie material indicating the petitioner's participation in the alleged conspiracy, including his role in introducing co-accused, facilitating communications, and assisting the key conspirator. The trial Court further held that at the stage of discharge, detailed appreciation of evidence is impermissible and that the material on record raised sufficient grounds to presume the petitioner's involvement in the alleged offences. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner filed the present Criminal Revision Case.

Held: In the light of the submissions made by both the learned counsel and a perusal of the material available on record, the contention of petitioner/A.2 who is revision petitioner is that there is no material to frame charge against him. There is no prior meeting of minds to make allegations against him, whereas, the counter filed by the respondent shows that the telephonic surveillance initiation during the registration of case proves that there is deep rooted conspiracy between the petitioner herein and other accused and all the telephonic conversations are cited as undeniable evidence along with charge sheet. Further there is a WhatsApp chat of petitioner with A.1, A.3 to A.5 and the petitioner along with other accused demanded huge amount of Rs.100 Crores as bribe from a person who is an accused, in settling his case in his favour. When there is material on record to show accusations against the petitioner, the question of discharging him from the offences does not arise.

Further it is noted that the material filed along with charge sheet, the telephonic conversations and WhatsApp chat shows involvement of petitioner in this case. The



contention of petitioner about remote possibility of using phone in Tihar jail and conversing with the other accused is nothing but illusory, whereas the said ground cannot be considered at the stage of framing of charges. While framing the charge, there cannot be any mini-trial and there is no assumption or presumption, whether it will be proved or disproved. At the time of framing charge, the evidence or documents submitted by the accused cannot be considered and the only material filed by the investigating authority is relevant. The material filed by the investigating authority i.e., WhatsApp chats, telephonic conversations and also the allegation that A.2 was also indulged in the crime with full knowledge cannot be ruled out and petitioner in conspiracy with A.5 impersonated as Saketh Kumar, IAS approached Smt Nina Verma, PA to Vijay Mallya and falsely promised her to help Vijay Mallya in settling the case against him. Smt Nina Verma also received various phone calls and text messages from UK based mobile number and received missed call from landline spoofed number of Ministry of Home Affairs. All these materials cannot be brushed aside at the stage of framing of charge. As held in **Central Bureau of Investigation V Aryan Singh [2023 SCC OnLine SC 379]**, that conducting a mini-trial is not permissible at the stage of discharge or quashing. The charges are required to be proved during the trial on the basis of evidence led by the investigating agency. While exercising the powers under Section 482 of Cr.P.C, the Court has a very limited jurisdiction and is required to consider whether any sufficient material is available to proceed further against the accused for which the accused is required to be tried or not. Further, in **State of Orissa V Debendra Nath Padhi [AIR 2005 SC]**, it was held that at the time of framing charge or taking cognizance the accused has no right to produce any material. Therefore, I see no illegality in the order of trial Court in dismissing the discharge petition of the petitioner. Hence, the same is liable to be dismissed. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is dismissed. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.



HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE RENUKA YARA

Acts/Rules: Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (Liquidation process) Regulations, 2016, etc

Case Details: Sanjiv Kumar Gupta Vs The State of Telangana and 3 others in WRIT PETITION NO. 27253 of 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 16-03-2026.

Facts: The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner purchased premises bearing No.D-4, Phase-IV Extension, IDA Jeedimetla, Hyderabad from M/s. Victory



Transformers and Switchgears Ltd., in an auction conducted on 21.02.2020 by the Insolvency Professional under aegis of NCLAT. In the said auction, the sale certificate was issued in favour of the petitioner on 02.09.2020. On 24.06.2021, the Official Liquidator executed a registered sale deed in favour of the petitioner and the same was registered vide document No.17172 of 2021 and conveyed with absolute title, right and interest with respect to the property consisting of industrial plot with constructed structures, shed bearing No.D-4 (ground plus two floors) with a plinth area of 28684 Sq.ft., RCC and 1800 Sq.ft., ACC, in all admeasuring 2917.33 Sq.yds., in IDA, Phase-IV (Extn), IDA Jeedimetla situated at Gajularamaram Village, Qutubullapur Mandal.

The property which was originally owned and possessed by M/s. Victory Transformers and Switchgears Ltd., went into liquidation vide insolvency proceedings dated 29.10.2019 in M.A.No.1139/2019 in CP No.1515/IB/2018 of NCLT. After the petitioner purchased the subject property in the auction, respondent No.3 issued a demand notice dated 26.07.2025 for payment of Rs.2,64,364/- along with applicable surcharges towards FSA charges. The petitioner submitted an explanation on 11.08.2025 stating that the claim of respondent No.3 was set aside by National Company Law Tribunal (NCLT) by holding that it is only after purchase of the property that the authorities can levy tax on the petitioner but not for the period during which M/s. Victoria Transformers was the owner. The claim for power charges made in the impugned demand notice is therefore arbitrary and illegal.

Held: When the version of the respective parties is examined, it is seen that the learned counsel for the petitioner relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **Ghanashyam Mishra & Sons (P) Ltd., v. Edelweiss [2021 9 SCC 657]**, wherein it is held as under:

“69. This aspect has been aptly explained by this Court in the case of Committee of Creditors of Essar Steel India Limited through Authorised Signatory (supra).

“107. For the same reason, the impugned NCLAT judgment [Standard Chartered Bank v. Satish Kumar Gupta, 2019 SCC OnLine NCLAT 388] in holding that claims that may exist apart from those decided on merits by the resolution professional and by the Adjudicating Authority/Appellate Tribunal can now be decided by an appropriate forum in terms of Section 60(6) of the Code, also militates against the rationale of Section 31 of the Code. A successful resolution applicant cannot suddenly be faced with “undecided” claims after the resolution plan submitted by him has been accepted as this would amount to a hydra head popping up which would throw into uncertainty amounts payable by a prospective resolution



applicant who would successfully take over the business of the corporate debtor. All claims must be submitted to and decided by the resolution professional so that a prospective resolution applicant knows exactly what has to be paid in order that it may then take over and run the business of the corporate debtor. This the successful resolution applicant does on a fresh slate, as has been pointed out by us hereinabove. For these reasons, NCLAT judgment must also be set aside on this count.”

The judgment in the case of **Mamta Binani v. Kolkata Municipal Corporation [2026 Lawsuit (Cal) 214]** was relied upon wherein it is held that it is conclusively settled principle of law that statutory and Governmental dues including the statutory dues owed to Central or State Governments or local authorities shall stand extinguished if they are not part of approved resolution plan.

To the contrary, learned counsel for the respondents relied upon the judgment in **TSSPDCL v. Srighdaa Beverages [2020 6 SCC 404]**, wherein it is held that electricity dues being statutory in character under the Electricity Act and as per the terms and conditions to supply, cannot be waived and cannot partake the character of dues of purely contractual nature. This finding was given against the auction purchaser, who participated in the auction under the SARFAESI Act, 2002. When the auction is conducted under the SARFAESI Act and purchaser has purchased in the auction and the sale is on ‘as is where is, whatever there is and without recourse basis’, the liability to pay electricity dues survives on the purchaser i.e., said liabilities do not stand extinguished.

To the contrary, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in Ghanashyam Mishra (supra) has clearly held that once a resolution plan is approved, in case statutory and Governmental dues are not presented before the liquidator, such statutory and Governmental dues claims shall stand extinguished. The language is crystal clear. Unless a claim is made before the resolution professional and claim is part of the resolution plan, the State Government or Central Government or local authority cannot make any claim subsequently.

The rights of an auction purchaser under SARFAESI Act are not similar to rights of an auction purchaser under IBC. As already discussed, the statutory dues remain to be liable to be paid i.e., the electricity dues exist, but such is not the case in an auction which is conducted under IBC. The writ petitioner, who is an auction purchase under IBC is not liable to pay statutory dues i.e., electricity dues stood extinguished once there was approved resolution plan. Therefore, the respondents cannot rely upon the judgment in Srighdaa Beverages (supra) in support of their claim.



Furthermore, the respondents did not submit its claim for arrears of Rs.2,64,364/- before the resolution professional to be considered for proportional settlement under approved resolution plan. Such being the case, once the statutory dues have extinguished, the respondents cannot make any claims against the auction purchaser. Hence, the writ petitioner is entitled to relief as prayed for.

Coming to the sustainability of the demand notice dated 26.07.2025, it is to be noted that arrears pertain to the period 2008-09, whereas the demand notice was issued in the year 2025, after a lapse of almost 16 years. As per the judgment in Sri Sai Baba Cellulose Pvt. Ltd. (supra), the limitation period to claim arrears is two years as per Section 56 (2) of the Electricity Act. The respondents are precluded from making even a supplementary demand on the ground of mistake or bona fide error. As such, the respondents under Section 56 (2) of the Electricity Act, are precluded from making original as well as supplementary demand for recovery of arrears of electricity dues. Thus, on the count of limitation too, the impugned demand notice dated 26.07.2025 is unsustainable.

In the result, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned demand notice issued in Lr.No.SE/OP/MCL/SAO/AAO(HT)/JAO(HT)/d.No.1328, dated 26.07.2025 issued to the petitioner claiming arrears of Rs.2,64,364/- pertaining to the period 2008-09 in respect of the petitioner's unit is set aside and consequently, the respondents are directed not to disconnect the power supply to the unit of the petitioner pursuant to the said demand notice. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this petition, shall stand closed.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NARSING RAO NANDIKONDA

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

Case Details: Madishetty Narsaiah and 10 Others Vs Madishetty Rajanna and 11 Others in CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.6485 of 2016 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 12.02.2026

Facts: The brief facts of the case are that Defendant Nos.3 and others filed IA No.459 of 2016 in IA No.174 of 1997 in OS No.98 of 1978 under Section 151 of C.P.C. on the file of Prl. Senior Civil Judge, at Karimnagar (herein referred as 'trial Court) seeking direction to the legal representatives of Defendant No.1 to deposit the jewellery of



silver and gold and rent, the trial Court allowed the IA No.459 of 2016, dated 29.11.2016. Aggrieved the said order, the present Civil Revision Petition is filed.

Held: Considering the contention and rival contentions of both the parties, the point which arose in the present petition was in respect of production of the gold and silver ornaments mentioned in schedule 'B', which allege to have been in possession of the deceased defendant No.1. Admittedly, the petitioners herein are the legal heirs of the defendant No.1 and they are bound to produce the said jewellery items before the Court. Though it is contended by the petitioners that they have no knowledge about the said I.A. No. 459 of 2016 and the trial Court disposed of the application without issuing notice to the petitioners herein and no opportunity was given to them to file the counter and contest the matter and further denied about the handing over of the property or the jewellery to them by the deceased defendant No- 1.

However, on careful perusal of the order passed by the learned trial Court clearly shows that the petitioners herein were already represented by one counsel by name Sri E.Raja Reddy and that record would reveals that the respondents therein/petitioners herein have also filed counter by denying the allegation by the petitioners therein and also contended that they have not received any jewellery of gold and silver items from the deceased defendant No-1 and the trial judge having consider the submissions made by both the parties have passed the impugned order.

The other contention of the petitioners herein that the defendant No.1 did not handed over the jewellery to the petitioner herein, whereas, the order dated 24.11.1990 in AS No.9 of 1985 would at Paragraph No.16 would clearly stated that to the extent item Nos.1 to 15 of plaint 'B' movable property belongs to Joint Family and were available for partition and was in the possession of Defendant No.1 (Sri Madiseti Durgaiiah).

It is also evident that the gold and silver articles were entrusted to the defendant No.1 to that effect a specific finding in the judgment passed by the learned trial court in respect of the 'B' Schedule movables properties, which says that a few days prior to the death of 1st Defendant's father, he has handed over the Schedule 'B' jewels, namely about 32 tulas of gold ornaments, about 110 tulas of silver ornaments, three sewing machines and other articles to the defendant No.1 and asked him to divide the same in between the members of the family after his death. In that way, the Schedule 'B' items were entrusted to the defendant No.1 and the said jewellery were also produced before the Advocate Commissioner, and after evaluation the value of the jewellery the same was entrusted under custody of Defendant No.1

Though it is denied by the learned counsel for the petitioners, but as the record speaks contrary, as such, the record clearly shows that the jewellery items of gold and silver



were given in custody of defendant No.1 and nothing has been placed before this Court by the petitioners herein to show that there was no such entrustment of the gold and jewellery. As such, it appears from the record that the trial Court has passed the order basing on the material available.

For the said reasons cited, this Court do not see any grounds to interfere with the order passed by the learned trial Court in I.A. No. 459 of 2016 in I.A. No. 174 of 1997 in O.S. No. 98 of 1978, dated 29.11.2016. Accordingly, Civil Revision petition deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed. Miscellaneous petitions, if any are pending, shall stand closed.



HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE TIRUMALA DEVI EADA

Acts/Rules: Indian Penal Code, 1860 etc

Case Details: Neha Singh Vs The State of Telangana in CRIMINAL PETITION No.8289 OF 2021 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 03.02.2026.

Facts: The case of prosecution is that the petitioner is a girl friend of the accused No.1 and that she along with accused No.1 harassed the defacto complainant for want of additional dowry, committed stalking by fixing an electronic device in her car and threatened her.

Learned petitioner's counsel submits that accused No.1 is the husband of the de facto complainant and that the petitioner herein is alleged to be a girl friend of accused No.1. He further submitted that the only allegation against the petitioner herein is that she along with accused No.1 has harassed the de facto complainant for obtaining mutual consent divorce between accused No.1 and the de facto complainant. He further submitted that there is no material to attract the ingredients of the offences alleged against the petitioner herein. Even as per the statement of LW1/defacto complainant, there are no specific allegations against the petitioner. The offence under Section 498-A does not get attracted against the petitioner as she is no way related either to the accused No.1 or the de facto complainant. He further submitted that the allegations for the offence under Section 354-D also does not get attracted against accused No.2, who is a lady. Further, the ingredients do not point out any offences under Sections 427 or 506 of IPC. In support of his contentions, learned counsel has relied upon the decisions of the Apex Court in **Dechamma I.M. alias Dechamma Koushik Vs. State of Karnataka and another [2024 SCC Online SC 3853]**



and **xxx vs. State of Gujarat and another [2025 SCC Online Guj 1532]** . He therefore prayed to quash the proceedings against the petitioner.

The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has submitted that the law is well settled with regard to the applicability of Section 498-A to a girl friend or a concubine. He also submitted that the allegation under Section 506 IPC may get attracted against the petitioner herein as the allegations prima facie point out the said offence. He therefore prayed to pass appropriate orders.

Held: As far as the allegations of the offence under Section 506 IPC is concerned, in view of the law laid down by the Apex Court in **Manik Taneja Vs.State of Karnataka [(2015) 7 SCC 423]** case, there must be an act of threatening to another person of causing an injury to the person, reputation, or property of the person threatened or to the person in which the threatened person is interested and the threat must be with the intent to cause alarm to the person threatened or it must be to do any act which is not legally bound to do or omit to do an act which he is legally entitled to do. In the present case, when the ingredients of the complaint are looked into, no such incidents of causing alarm to the defacto complainant are made out. Hence, the said Section of law do not get attracted against the petitioner.

Thus, in the facts and circumstances of the case. None of the allegations make out a prima facie case against the petitioner herein to attract the offences under Sections 498A, 354-D, 427 and 506 of IPC. Hence, continuation of proceedings against the petitioner would be an abuse of process of law.

Hence, the Criminal Petition is allowed and the proceedings against the petitioner/accused No.2 in C.C.No.6343 of 2021, on the file of the learned XIII Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Hyderabad, are hereby quashed.

Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.



THE HON'BLE JUSTICE B.R.MADHUSUDHAN RAO

Acts/Rules: Section 26, Order 7 Rule 1 r/w Section 151 of Civil Procedure Code, 1908, etc.

Case Details: D.Sree Laxmi Vs Smt.P.Anuradha and Another in APPEAL SUIT NOs.237 AND 238 OF 2020 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 24-02-2026



Facts: Respondent-plaintiff has filed suit in OS No.606 of 2013 against the appellant-defendant under Section 26, Order 7 Rule 1 r/w Section 151 of Civil Procedure Code, 1908 (for short 'CPC') for partition of A & B schedule properties, deposit of 'C' schedule properties and deposit a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- towards 50% share in 'D' schedule property.

Schedule 'A' property is Residential House with three Mulgies in Plot No.49-C, admeasuring 289 square yards situated in Sy.Nos.30 to 39 of Mangapuram Colony under the Village limits of Meerpet, Uppal Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

Schedule 'B' property is Residential House in Plot No.165, admeasuring 521 square yards situated in Sy.No.319 in Jafferguda, Hamlet of Batasingaram Village, Hayathnagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

Schedule 'C' properties are Gold ornaments weighing about 150 grams and Silver Articles weighing about 5 Kgs and other house hold articles belonging to late G.Venkat Rama Reddy.

Schedule 'D' property is Maruthi Suzuki Swift Desire bearing Registration No.AP 29 AH 1718.

Held: The learned trial Court has properly appreciated the facts of the case in right prospective and rightly decreed the suit of the respondent- plaintiff for partition in respect of 'A', 'B' and 'D' schedule properties, this Court is of the view that there is no perversity or illegality in the judgment and decree, requires no interference in view of the fact that appellant-defendant failed to prove Ex.B1-Will Deed dated 24.06.2010 and also failed to prove that she is entitled for perpetual injunction in respect of 'A' schedule property, as the suit filed by the appellant-defendant in OS.No.1316 of 2015 is based on Ex.B1-Will Deed dated 24.06.2010.

Appellant has not made out any case to interfere with the judgment passed by the learned V Additional District and Sessions Judge, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar. Appeals deserves no consideration and the same are liable to be dismissed and are accordingly dismissed. AS.No.237 of 2020 and AS.No.238 of 2020 are dismissed without costs. Interim Orders if any stands vacated. Miscellaneous application/s stands closed.



THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.M. MOHIUDDIN

Acts/Rules: Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007, etc

Case Details: C. Srinivas. Vs The State of Telangana and others. in WRIT APPEAL Nos.197, 198 and 199 OF 2026 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 27-02-2026. *(as per the GMMJ)*

Facts: It is the case of the appellant that despite the stay order of this Court, the 2nd respondent passed an ante-dated order, dated 18.03.2025 condoning the delay in filing review/second appeal and remanding the matter to the District Collector for fresh de novo consideration. The appellant relies on the order being dispatched on 25.03.2025 to support the contention that the order was ante- dated. The appellant challenged the said remand order by filing W.P.No.10245 of 2025. The appellant also initiated contempt proceedings against 2nd respondent vide Contempt Case No.827 of 2025 alleging violation of the interim order dated 21.03.2025 granted in W.P. No.8647 of 2025.

Pursuant to the remand, the 3rd respondent i.e., Additional District Collector, issued notice through WhatsApp on 28.03.2025 directing the appellant to appear for a hearing on 02.04.2025. The appellant appeared and submitted a representation bringing to the notice of the authority, the pendency of the writ petitions and the interim orders granted by this Court and requested that the proceedings be deferred. Regardless of the same, the 3rd respondent by order dated 22.04.2025, allowed the appeal and ordered cancellation of the Gift Deed dated 06.04.2018, holding that the matter fell within the scope of Section 23 of the 2007 Act.

The appellant challenged the order of the 3rd respondent dated 22.04.2025 by filing W.P.No.15033 of 2025. An interim suspension of the impugned order was granted on 07.05.2025.

All the three writ petitions, namely W.P.Nos.8647 of 2025, 10245 of 2025 and 15033 of 2025, along with the Contempt Case No.827 of 2025, were disposed of vide orders dated 18.09.2025. Learned Single Judge dismissed W.P.No.15033 of 2025 on merits, and upheld the order dated 22.04.2025 of the 3rd respondent directing cancellation of the Gift Deed. Consequently, W.P.Nos.8647 of 2025 and 10245 of 2025 were dismissed as having become infructuous, and the Contempt Case was closed. Aggrieved by the orders dated 18.09.2025 in W.P.Nos.8647 of 2025, 10245 of 2025 and 15033 of 2025, the appellant has preferred the present writ appeals.



Held: The learned Single Judge has observed that the appellant/petitioner had played fraud upon the Sub-Registrar by allegedly tampering with or misrepresenting the interim order of this Court. However, the material placed on record indicates that upon the grant of interim suspension on 07.05.2025 in W.P.No.15033 of 2025, the appellant/petitioner addressed a communication to the Sub-Registrar to appraise the registering authority of the said judicial order. The inclusion of the Sub-Registrar in the cause title of the representation as contended by the learned counsel for the appellant appears to have been intended to secure compliance with the interim direction and to avoid further action pursuant to the alleged cancellation. There is no material to suggest any alteration, fabrication, or distortion of the Court's order inasmuch as a copy of the interim order itself was appended to the representation. In the absence of clear and cogent evidence establishing deliberate deception, a finding of fraud entailing serious civil consequences, ought not to have been recorded.

For the foregoing reasons, this Court is of the considered opinion that the orders dated 18.09.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge cannot be sustained and is liable to be set aside. The initiation of proceedings before the 2nd respondent, styled as a 'second appeal' against the order dated 06.07.2023 of the 3rd respondent (District Collector), was wholly without statutory authority and jurisdiction. The assumption of such jurisdiction being void, the consequential remand order dated 18.03.2025, cannot be sustained. All consequential proceedings, including the order dated 22.04.2025 passed by the 3rd respondent are also liable to be set aside.

Accordingly, W.A.Nos.197, 198 and 199 of 2026 are allowed and the impugned orders dated 18.09.2025 passed in W.P.Nos.15033, 8647 and 10245 of 2025 by the learned Single Judge are set aside.

Consequently, W.P.No.15033 of 2025 stands allowed and the order dated 22.04.2025 passed by the 3rd respondent in Case No.61/E/2023 is quashed; W.P.No.8647 of 2025 stands allowed and it is declared that the 2nd respondent lacked jurisdiction to entertain Appeal No.S1/565/2025 against the order dated 06.07.2023 of the 3rd respondent (District Collector). Accordingly notice dated 10.03.2025 and the order dated 18.03.2025 issued by the 2nd respondent therein are quashed; and W.P. No.10245 of 2025 stands allowed and the order dated 18.03.2025 passed by the 2nd respondent in Appeal No.S1/565/2025 is quashed as being without jurisdiction.

It is clarified that no opinion is expressed on the substantive rights of the 4th respondent to seek cancellation of the Gift Deed dated 06.04.2018; or on the appellant's claim in respect of alleged improvements to the property. All such issues are left open to be agitated before the competent Civil Court in accordance with law.



Consequently, miscellaneous petitions pending if any shall stand closed. No order as to costs.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUDDALA CHALAPATHI RAO

Acts/Rules: Constitution of India, etc.

Case Details: M/s.Brilliant Bio Pharma Ltd Vs State of Telangana in WRIT PETITION NOs.27374 & 30563 OF 2014 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 10-03-2026.

Facts: The brief facts of the case in W.P.No.27374 of 2014 are that, the petitioner's company, earlier was known as 'Brilliant Industries Limited,' and that Brilliant Industries Ltd., was the absolute owner and possessor of land admeasuring Acs.3.11 guntas, situated in Sy.Nos.31, 32, 34, 35 and 38 of Tondupalli Village, Shamshabad Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, having purchased the same in the year 1998 vide a registered sale deed from its original pattadar for a valid sale consideration. The petitioner contends though the land along with other adjacent land was proposed to be acquired for the purpose of formation of Outer Ring Road (ORR) Project, that they were unaware of any proceedings initiated under the then Land Acquisition Act, 1894, for acquisition of the other lands along with the petitioner's land to an extent Acs.3.11 guntas, and the petitioner came to know of the said acquisition only after passing of the award and the reference being made under Section 30 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to the competent Court and the petitioner was constrained to file W.P.Nos.27089 and 27399 of 2006 before this Court.

It is stated that the very purchasing of the said land was for the purpose of establishing a star hotel industry or appropriate business as the Government policy was also to encourage the industries and lieu of that the Industries Department granted several incentives. Further, since the land of the petitioner was at the proximity of the Rajiv Gandhi International Airport at Shamshabad and it was feasible for the purpose of construction of a hotel. It is contended that by the said acquisition, the petitioner was deprived of many incentives given by the Industries Department and by virtue of the acquisition, petitioner approached the Government and filed a detailed representation by bringing to knowledge of the then Government dated 15.12.2008 and after several correspondences and lot of exercise, the Government after getting appropriate remarks from the Project Director and Special Collector, ORR along with the Commissioner, Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority, Hyderabad



(HMDA), based on the separate reports dated 11.08.2009 and 08.04.2010 of the said authorities respectively to the Government vide the said reports, the Commissioner, HMDA has reported that the land in Sy.No.775, which belonged to erstwhile HUDA and the same is in the possession of HMDA which is also free from all encumbrances can be allotted to the petitioner in lieu of the land and accordingly, recommended for handing over the said land in favour of the petitioner in lieu of the compensation for the acquired lands for the purpose of ORR project, subject to withdrawal of W.P.Nos.27089 and 27399 of 2006. Further, it is stated that the said land is covered under G.O.Ms.No.111, dated 08.03.1996, where polluting/potential polluting establishments are prohibited.

After considering the issue, the Government in exercise of its executive powers, issued an executive fiat vide G.O.Ms.No.269 MA & UD (I) Department, dated 30.06.2010, whereby and where under, the Government acceded to the representation of the petitioner and in lieu of compensation for the land which fell for exercising is eminent domain power, the land belonging to HMDA in Sy.No.775 of Shamshabad Village and Mandal, to an equal extent of Acs.3.12 guntas was allotted to the petitioner, and however, the matter was placed before the Cabinet for its approval and after approval from the Cabinet, the Government Order has been issued and pursuant to the Government decision, the HMDA has issued a proceedings vide No.LA/ORR/Unit-1/19/74/2005, dated 10.05.2011, in pursuance of the Government Order dated 30.06.2010 for allotting the land in Sy.No.775 to an equal extent of Acs.3.12 guntas situated in Shamshabad Village and Mandal, Ranga Reddy District to the petitioner and that subsequent thereupon, it is stated that the HMDA has executed a registered Conveyance Deed vide Document No.1365 of 2011 dated 19.05.2011 duly registering the said land before the Sub-Registrar, Shamshabad. Further, in pursuance of the execution of said conveyance deed, the physical possession was handed to the petitioner under the cover of panchanama dated 01.06.2011 and that by virtue of the said conveyance deed, the petitioner has acquired right, title and interest along with possession over the said land in Sy.No.775 admeasuring Acs.3.12 guntas in Shamshabad Village and Mandal, Ranga Reddy District and consequently, the writ petitions were withdrawn by the petitioner on 07.06.2010.

However, in the meanwhile the said allotment of land to the petitioner was questioned by way of a Probono litigation in PIL No.346 of 2012 and pursuant to the filing of counter-affidavit by the HMDA as well as the State, the said PIL was withdrawn by the petitioner on 05.06.2013 and the quantum of compensation which was deposited in the competent Court for the land of the petitioner under Section 30 of the Act was withdrawn by the Government as the alternate land was granted in favour of petitioner. In pursuance of the same, compromise entered before the Lok-Adalath,



Ranga Reddy District, and the said conveyance deed was fortified even in the Lok-Adalath award and that the petitioner was acquired absolute ownership rights over the land in Sy.No.775 admeasuring Acs.3.12 guntas situated in Shamshabad Village and Mandal, Ranga Reddy District by virtue of the said conveyance deed executed by the HMDA and the directions of the Government.

Now peculiarly and surprisingly the HMDA i.e. the respondent No.3, after the execution of the conveyance deed in favour of the petitioner, has issued the impugned show-cause notice bearing No.11172/EMU/HMDA/09 dated 09.09.2014, which was served upon the petitioner on 31.09.2014 and by the said impugned show-cause notice, the petitioner was called upon to explain as to why the allotment of land made in their favour, in contravention of the standing orders, to an extent of Acs.3.12 guntas in Sy.No.775 of HMDA layout at Shamshabad Village and Mandal Ranga Reddy District, should not be cancelled, thereby the explanation was within 7 days from the date of receipt of the said notice. Further, the main ground for issuance of the said show-cause notice was that G.O.Ms.No.269 dated 30.06.2010 relates to only one case i.e., of M/s.Brilliant Bio Pharma Limited and the said G.O., is not in conformity with the spirit of G.O.Ms.No.14 dated 18.12.2006, which was issued after detailed deliberation and taking advantage of the allotment made in favour of M/s. Brilliant Bio Pharma Limited, the other awardees are also requesting to allow the alternate land in lieu of acquired land for formation of ORR, thus the said allotment is sought to be cancelled and that the said show-cause notice is impugned in the Writ Petition No.27374 of 2014.

Held: In the instant case, the property has already been conveyed in favour of the petitioners and thus, the respondents have already ceased to be the owners of the land. As such, they cannot now turn back and propose to cancel the conveyance deed, and the appropriate remedy available to them is to approach the competent civil Court and avail the common law remedies available under law.

On the contrary, the respondent Nos.2 and 3 being instrumentalities of the Government, are bound to follow dictum of the 1st respondent-Government and more so, when a Cabinet approval for allotment of alternate land to the petitioner was sought and approved, the respondent Nos.2 and 3, who are the statutory authorities have implemented it and contrary to the same, the impugned notice dated 09.09.2014 is issued. It is trite law that the directions of the Government are binding on the statutory authorities and when the authority acts on administrative control, the authority functions as an arm of the executive and the Government dicta is binding as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sant Ram Sharma v. State of Rajasthan and others [AIR 1967 SC 1910]**. The statutory authority on administrative side cannot alter the decision of the Government, more so, when the conveyance deed is executed, the



authorities have to approach common law remedies by approaching the competent Civil Court seeking cancellation of the conveyance deed, and in that view of the matter, in considered view of this Court, the impugned show-cause notice dated 09.09.2014 is ex facie illegal and arbitrary, void ab initio and violative of the settled principles of law. Thus, the impugned show-cause notice is liable to be set aside and quashed.

In the above stated findings arrived by this Court, the impugned show-cause notice vide No.11772/EMU/HMDA/09, dated 09.09.2014 is hereby set aside and quashed and the writ petitioner is at liberty to deal with the property with all absolute ownership right without there being any letter from the respondent authorities.

Insofar as the prayer in W.P.No.30563 of 2014 is concerned, the learned Senior Counsel Mr. Alladi Ravinder would contend that there was a small mistake crept in the conveyance deed, wherein the description of the vendee name was erroneously mentioned as 'Sri R.Madan Mohan Rao, S/o. late Sri Sheshagiri Rao, aged 63 years, Executive Director, Brilliant Bio-Pharma Limited/Brilliant Industries limited, R/o.9-84, Panduranganagar, Hyderabad'. However, the actual nomenclature should have been 'Brilliant Industries Private Limited, Hyderabad, represented by its Executive Director, Mr. R.Madan Mohan Rao', and it is stated that a detailed representation dated 26.08.2014 has been filed before the respondent Nos.2 and 3.

In the light of the above, the respondents are hereby directed to examine the said representation, and if so required, and intended by the petitioner, shall consider the representation dated 26.08.2014 forthwith and execute a rectification deed, duly correcting the mistake crept in the conveyance deed bearing document No.1365, dated 19.05.2011.

In view of the same, the W.P.No.30563 of 2014 is disposed of accordingly.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition No.27374 of 2014 is allowed and the W.P.No.30563 of 2014 is disposed of in terms of the above stated directions. There shall be no order as to costs. Pending miscellaneous applications if any shall stand closed.



THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K. LAKSHMAN
AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

Acts/Rules: Section 13 (1) (i) (a) of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, etc.

Case Details: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Vs XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX in FAMILY COURT APPEAL No. 195 of 2014 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 19-01-2026.

(As per the Hon'ble Sri Justice Vakiti Ramakrishna Reddy)

Facts: The petitioner filed a petition under Section 13 (1) (i) (a) of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (for short 'HMA'), seeking dissolution of her marriage with the respondent. The averments of the petition in brief are as under:

a) The petitioner was a student pursuing Bachelor of Dental Surgery (BDS) at Meghana Institute of Dental Science, at Mallaram Village, Nizamabad District. In or about September, 2010, the respondent, who was residing in the same locality at Harijanwada, Utnoor Town, Adilabad District, started making repeated phone calls and sending messages to the petitioner through his Mobile Phone No. 73823 04608, expressing his desire to meet the petitioner, for which the petitioner clearly informed the respondent that she was not interested to meet him. She also specifically requested him not to make any phone calls or send any messages. Despite the same, the respondent came to the petitioner's college and expressed his intention to marry her. But the petitioner refused the said proposal and warned the respondent that she would lodge a police complaint if he continued to harass her. On 07.05.2012, the respondent again came to the college and requested the petitioner to meet him at the bus stand to talk. The petitioner stated that she went to Nizamabad Bus Stand, where the respondent had shown her a bottle, stating that it contained acid, and threatened her to follow him silently without crying or creating any nuisance on the road, or else he would pour acid on her. Fearing for life, the petitioner silently boarded the Bus. The petitioner pleaded with the respondent not to ruin her career and informed him that she is only daughter to her parents and that her father, with great difficulty, had managed to get her admitted into the college. However, the respondent did not heed to her request.

b) On the same day at about 9.00 PM, the petitioner and the respondent got down from the bus at MGBS, Gowliguda, Hyderabad. Thereafter, on 08.05.2012 at 10.00 AM, the respondent again forcibly took the petitioner in a Bus and reached Nellore. The respondent took the petitioner in an Auto Rickshaw to his friend's room and confined



her thereby locking the said room. Next day morning i.e., on 09.05.2012, the respondent took the petitioner in an Auto to an Office, where he forcibly obtained two signatures of petitioner on certain papers and register/book, and thereafter again brought the petitioner back to his friend's room. On the same day, again the respondent took the petitioner to a temple along with his friends and took photographs along with them and there he had declared that he had married the petitioner. He further threatened her not to disclose the said incident to anybody or to her parents, or else he would kill her brother. With great difficulty, the petitioner returned to Hyderabad and there-from to Nizamabad. Due to fear and threat she did not disclose the incident to anyone.

c) In August, 2013, when the petitioner was appearing for the practical examinations of the final year of BDS course, the respondent again came to the college and threatened her stating that after completion of her exams, he would take her with him. He also handed a copy of an alleged marriage certificate. The petitioner then discussed the matter with her parents and lodged a complaint against the respondent before SHO, Rural Police Station, Nizamabad. The petitioner stated that she had no knowledge of the alleged marriage dated 09.05.2012, which according to her, was performed under coercion and threat by the respondent. Hence, the petitioner sought dissolution of the marriage.

Held: On a careful consideration of the pleadings, evidence on record, statutory scheme, and authoritative pronouncements relied upon, this Court records the following findings:

- (i) The Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, by virtue of the express exclusion under Section 2(2), does not apply to the petitioner, who belongs to a Scheduled Tribe, in the absence of a Central Government notification extending its applicability.
- (ii) The registration of the alleged marriage under the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, or the performance of marriage according to Hindu rites and customs, does not confer legal validity when one of the parties is not amenable to the provisions of the said Act.
- (iii) Mere performance of marriage according to Hindu customs, without specific pleading and cogent proof that the petitioner had abandoned tribal customs and was governed exclusively by Hindu traditions, is insufficient to attract the applicability of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955.
- (iv) The burden to plead and prove that the petitioner was “Hinduised” or governed by Hindu customs squarely lay upon the respondent, which burden has not been discharged.



(v) The Family Court committed a jurisdictional error in adjudicating the lis under the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, without first framing and deciding the foundational issue relating to statutory applicability.

(vi) Consequently, the impugned order and decree passed by the Family Court is vitiated in law.

The above findings conclusively answer Point Nos. (i) to (v) framed for determination. The appeal is allowed.

The order and decree dated 11.07.2014 passed by the Family Court-cum-Additional District Judge, Nizamabad, in O.P. No. 158 of 2013, is hereby set aside.

It is declared that the alleged marriage between the petitioner and the respondent, insofar as it is sought to be recognised or enforced under the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, is void and unenforceable in law.

There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, pending miscellaneous applications, if any, in this Appeal shall also stand closed.



THE HON'BLE JUSTICE MOUSHUMI BHATTACHARYA

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GADI PRAVEEN KUMAR

Acts/Rules: Rule 8(1) of the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short, 'the SARFAESI Act'), etc.

Case Details: M/s. Devesh Motors Private Limited Vs IDBI Bank Limited, through its Authorized Officer and another in WRIT PETITION No.38843 of 2025 ([Click here for full Judgment](#))

Date of Judgment: 05-01-2026.

(As per the Hon'ble Sri Justice Gadi Praveen Kumar)

Facts: The present Writ Petition is filed assailing the order dated 26.11.2025 passed by the Debts Recovery Tribunal, Hyderabad (DRT) in I.A.No.3255 of 2025 in S.A.No.485 of 2025 dismissing the SA along with the IA, as illegal and arbitrary.

The petitioner filed the SA before the learned DRT challenging the action of the 1st respondent bank in issuing the possession notice dated 29.08.2025 in respective paper publications along with symbolic possession notice dated 28.10.2025 under Rule 8(1) of the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short, 'the SARFAESI Act').



The petitioner also filed IA.No.3255 of 2025 seeking condonation of the delay of 22 days in filing SA.No.485 of 2025 under Section 17 of the SARFAESI Act, on the ground that despite payments after publication of possession notice dated 29.08.2025 and assurance dated 20.09.2025, without initiating any action, the 1strespondent bank is taking further measures.

The 1st respondent bank filed counter resisting the petition that both the SA and IA are filed through Special General Power of Attorney (SGPA) executed by Amudala Radha Krishnamurthy in his personal capacity, whereas the petitioner is a company and hence, the SGPA itself is invalid in the eye of law and accordingly, SA and IA are not maintainable. Further, no assurance was given by the 1strespondent bank with regard to further proceedings.

The learned DRT after considering the submissions made on behalf of both the parties, held that the SGPA dated 09.09.2025 stated to be executed in USA by Amudala Radha Krishna Murthy in favour of Dinesh Babu Kannan in his personal capacity. Admittedly, the petitioner is a private limited company represented by its Director. It is also observed that when the petitioner is a private limited company and having a separate legal entity, the power of attorney should have emanated from the resolution passed by the Board of the Directors of the company and not in the individual capacity of the Director. Hence, the SGPA is an invalid document for the purpose of filing SA under Section 17 of the SARFAESI Act and accordingly, concluded that the suitor of the SA is not an authorized person of the applicant company and hence, SA along with the subject IA are dismissed as not maintainable.

Held: Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner being well aware of the efficacious remedy of statutory appeal provided under Section 18 of the SARFAESI Act cannot be permitted to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

For the foregoing reasons, this Court is of considered view that the present Writ Petition is not maintainable in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, in view of the availability of an efficacious statutory remedy of appeal provided under Section 18 of the SARFAESI Act. Accordingly, without entering into or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, we do not wish to entertain the Writ Petition, leaving it open to the petitioner to avail and exhaust the alternative remedy of appeal as provided under Section 18 of the SARFAESI Act.

W.P.No.38843 of 2025, along with all connected applications, is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.





**Sanctioned strength, working strength and vacancy position
of Hon'ble Judges of High Court for
the State of Telangana as on 31.03.2026**

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 19.07.2025 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.)
 - A) Honourable Sri Justice Gouse Meera Mohiuddin
 - B) Honourable Sri Justice Suddala Chalapathi Rao
 - C) Honourable Sri Justice Vakiti Ramakrishna Reddy
 - D) Honourable Sri Justice Gadi Praveen Kumar





Statement of work done in the High Court as on 31.03.2026

NATURE OF CASES	PENDING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE MONTH I.E., AS ON 01.01.2026	INSTITUTIONS FROM 01.01.2026 TO 31.03.2026	DISPOSALS FROM 01.01.2026 TO 31.03.2026	PENDENCY
(A) ORIGINAL SIDE (CIVIL)	147962	11626	10652	148936
(B) APPELLATE SIDE (CIVIL)	56360	2536	2031	54135
(C) CRIMINAL SIDE	31239	5516	4467	32288

GRAND TOTAL:

GRAND TOTAL OF CIVIL CASES	201592	14162	12683	203071
GRAND TOTAL OF CRIMINAL CASES	31239	5516	4467	32288
GRAND TOTAL OF MAIN CASES	232831	19678	17150	235359





**Sanctioned strength, working strength and vacancy position of
Judicial Officers in the State of Telangana as on 31.03.2026**

S.No	Cadre Strength	Sanctioned Strength	Total Number of Judicial Officers Working	Total Number of Vacancies
1.	District Judges	188	148	40
2.	Senior Civil Judges	155	96	59
3	Junior Civil Judges	276	233	43
TOTAL		619	477	142

CIVIL JUDGES (JUNIOR DIVISION) 2025 – 2026

As per the Orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in W.P.(C) No. 1022/1989, the High Court for the State of Telangana on administrative side has proposed amendments to the Telangana State Judicial (Service and Cadre) Rules 2023, that the Govt of Telangana have approved the proposal and issued orders 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 of 94 vacancies in the cadre of Civil Judges (Junior Division) which includes carried forward vacancies of the year 2024 under Direct Recruitment and under Recruitment by Transfer (66 Posts under Direct Recruitment and 28 posts under Recruitment by Transfer), fixing the last date for submission of applications through online as 29-12-2025. Accordingly total of 1753 applications through online were received through online.

Further, scrutiny of applications was made and after rejection of defective applications, 1289 candidates were provisionally found eligible to appear for the screening test.

The computer based screening test for the provisionally eligible candidates was conducted on 08.03.2026 in the test centres provided by the Tata Consultancy Services Ltd., Subsequently, the results of the said screening test were declared on 28.03.2026, and the candidates have been shortlisted in the ratio of 1:10 of notified vacancies for



the next stage, i.e., the written examination. The dates for conducting the said written examination are decided by the High Court for the State of Telangana, as 20-06-2026 and 21-06-2026. Necessary steps are in progress pertaining to Pre-Examination process decided by the High Court for the State of Telangana.

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

The High Court, vide Notification Nos. 101/2026 and 102/2026, dated 02-02-2026, has initiated the recruitment process for 34 posts of Office Subordinate and 9 posts of Driver, fixing 28-02-2026 as the last date for submission of applications. Scrutiny of 8000 and odd Offline applications pertaining to the posts of Driver is completed. OMR-based examination for the post of Office Subordinate and the skill test (Driving Test) to the provisionally eligible applicants for the post of Driver shall be conducted in due course.





**Sanctioned strength, working strength and vacancy position of
Ministerial Staff in District Courts as on 31.03.2026**

Sanctioned strength	11118
Working strength	7056
Vacancies	4062

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

The High Court, vide Notification Nos. 1/2026 to 9/2026, dated 19-01-2026, initiated the recruitment process for filling up 859 posts in various categories, namely Junior Assistant, Field Assistant, Examiner, Record Assistant, Typist, Copyist, Stenographer (Grade 111), Process Server and Office Subordinate, and fixed the last date for submission of online applications as 13-02-2026.





**District-wise Statement of Institutions, Disposals and
Pendency of Cases from 01.01.2026 to 31.03.2026**

Sl.No	NAME OF THE DISTRICT / UNIT	CIVIL			CRIMINAL		
		INSTITUTION	DISPOSAL	PENDENCY	INSTITUTION	DISPOSAL	PENDENCY
1	ADILABAD	285	364	2,215	2,768	2,659	7,467
2	BHADRADRI KOTHAGUDEM	338	405	3,330	1,538	1,446	18,899
3	HANUMAKONDA	800	1,074	14,483	4,374	4,209	17,877
4	HYDERABAD-CBI	0	0	0	96	73	2,423
5	HYDERABAD-CCC	4,517	5,680	52,669	106	165	1,812
6	HYDERABAD-CSCC	104	112	1,151	0	0	0
7	HYDERABAD-MSJ	0	0	0	28,479	27,933	1,13,095
8	HYDERABAD-TRIBUNALS	155	103	2,971	0	3	10
9	JAGTIAL	390	357	5,061	1,075	1,008	11,776
10	JANGAON	287	346	5,880	435	472	6,075
11	JAYASHANKAR BHUPALPALLY	782	781	2,257	3,528	3,440	6,760
12	JOGULAMBA GADWAL	246	275	3,254	3,891	3,956	4,476
13	KAMAREDDY	217	335	3,301	824	1,021	10,611
14	KARIMNAGAR	1,035	1,087	12,548	2,343	2,019	26,630
15	KHAMMAM	1,331	1,885	11,841	6,482	6,356	24,159
16	KUMURAM BHEEM ASIFABAD	83	43	1,338	511	283	4,334
17	MAHABUBABAD	240	262	3,441	679	659	8,535
18	MAHABUBNAGAR	455	498	6,672	961	915	11,734
19	MANCHERIAL	555	647	6,016	3,488	3,564	13,852
20	MEDAK	300	265	3,676	1,044	1,038	9,861
21	MEDCHAL-MALKAJGIRI	4,787	5,108	32,885	4,879	3,763	62,294
22	MULUGU	55	68	713	186	236	2,696
23	NAGARKURNOOL	352	396	6,240	747	586	7,964
24	NALGONDA	1,080	1,232	14,792	1,650	1,894	27,016
25	NARAYANPET	978	910	2,542	2,345	2,111	4,689
26	NIRMAL	152	223	1,868	1,098	1,047	5,774
27	NIZAMABAD	794	1,473	7,404	1,583	1,692	17,803
28	PEDDAPALLI	756	759	6,087	1,316	1,215	12,522
29	RAJANNA SIRCILLA	369	383	4,460	1,447	1,432	9,199
30	RANGA REDDY	7,178	6,070	50,908	11,690	9,153	77,067
31	SANGAREDDY	1,364	1,695	15,709	2,167	2,075	19,016
32	SIDDIPET	842	880	9,108	4,420	3,630	15,943
33	SURYAPET	714	860	7,949	1,825	1,842	19,566
34	VIKARABAD	288	371	7,852	1,134	1,043	10,487
35	WANAPARTHY	365	443	4,453	1,635	1,720	6,757
36	WARANGAL	624	495	9,192	1,304	826	15,108
37	YADADRI BHUVANAGIRI	408	403	9,196	1,609	1,672	13,286
GRAND TOTAL		33,226	36,288	3,33,462	1,03,657	97,156	6,27,573





Activities of the Telangana State Legal Services Authority

SETTING UP OF LEGAL AID AND ADVICE CENTRE (STALL) BY TSLSA IN 85TH ALL INDIA INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, NUMAISH, NAMPALLY, HYDERABAD

Telangana State Legal Services Authority with the prior approval of Hon'ble Executive Chairman, TSLSA had set up "Legal Aid and Advice Centre" in the 85th All India Industrial Exhibition at Nampally, Hyderabad. The stall intends to create awareness on various laws and also availability of legal services among the visitors of the Stall.

Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad and Executive Chairman, Telangana State Legal Services Authority was pleased to inaugurate the Legal Aid and Advice Centre on 08.01.2026 in the said Exhibition. The functioning of the said Stall is monitored by Telangana State Legal Services Authority on day to day basis for achieving the objective of 'Access to Justice for all' in its true spirit, by deputing 2 Panel Lawyers a day.



National Girl Child Day on 24.01.2026

On the occasion of National Girl Child Day on 24.01.2026, the Telangana State Legal Services Authority in collaboration with Association for Voluntary Action, has organized 2 Kms Run with 500 girl students to create awareness among the students at L.B. Stadium for which the Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad and Executive Chairman, Telangana State Legal Services Authority, and Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Surepalli Nanda, Hon'ble Sri Justice E.V. Venugopal, Hon'ble Smt. Justice Renuka Yara, Judges of High Court for the State of Telangana have participated.



The District Legal Services Authority, Kamareddy, on 31.01.2026 conducted an Awareness Programme on the occasion of National Girl Child Day at Zilla Parishath Girls High School, Kamareddy. Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Executive Chairman, TSLSA, Hon'ble Sri. Justice Nandikonda Narsing Rao, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana and Member Secretary, TSLSA have participated in the programme.



On 05.01.2026, the Telangana State Legal Services Authority, Hyderabad, in co-ordination with Chinmay School, Hyderabad, conducted Legal Awareness Camp on the occasion of launching of “Road Suraksha Abhiyan, 2026”. Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana, Hyderabad and Executive Chairman, Telangana State Legal Services Authority and the Member Secretary, TSLSA have participated in the said programme.



One Day Sensitization Programme for referral Judges on ADR mechanism

On 3rd January, 2026 a One Day Sensitization Programme for referral Judges on ADR mechanism was conducted at TS Judicial Academy. Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana; Hon'ble Sri Justice K.Lakshman, Hon'ble Sri Justice K.Sarath, Hon'ble Sri Justice J. Sreenivas Rao, Judges, High Court for the State of Telangana and Member Secretary, TSLSA along with other Judicial officers have participated in the said programme.



In a recent visit to promote transparency and understand the conditions of inmates, the Member Secretary of the Telangana State Legal Services Authority (TSLSA) undertook a comprehensive tour of the Central Prison for Men at Chanchalguda, Hyderabad. During the visit, he interacted directly with the inmates, Officials, and staff to assess the Prison environment and discuss their needs.

The Member Secretary emphasized the importance of humane treatment, legal aid, and rehabilitation programs for inmates. He also inspected various facilities within the prison, including the medical unit and legal aid cell, ensuring they meet the prescribed standards.



On 14.02.2026, 40 hours Training Programme was conducted at DLSA, Mahabubnagar (cluster districts). Hon'ble Sri Justice Sreenivasa Rao, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana and the Member Secretary, TSLSA have attended the Training programme.



Legal Awareness Camp

18th February 2026 — A successful Legal Awareness Camp was organized by Telangana State Legal Services Authority with the primary objective of spreading awareness about labor laws, social security, and workers' rights. During the event, participants received valuable information on various legal provisions, safety regulations, and support systems available to them. A significant highlight of the camp was the distribution of SOCW Labour Cards, aimed at providing workers with official identification and access to social security benefits.

The event saw active participation from the Administrative Officer of the Telangana State Legal Services Authority (TSLSA), who engaged with the attendees and underscored the importance of legal literacy. The officer emphasized the role of legal awareness in empowering workers and ensuring their rights are protected under the law.



On 10.03.2026 the Chairperson, DLSA, Nirmal has inaugurated a new RO water plant at a Government School donated by Divyang Shakti Foundation and also wheel chairs to the differently abled students.



International Parental Child Abduction

A special monograph on "International Parental Child Abduction" was released by the Telangana State Legal Services Authority (TSLSA), Hyderabad by Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Executive Chairman, Telangana State Legal Services Authority on 10th March, 2026. The aim of this monograph is to create awareness on the issue of international parental abduction, which occurs when one of the parents takes the child abroad or due to a change of country. The legal issues and solutions faced by taking the child to other countries without the consent of one of the parents in cases like family disputes, divorces.



Inauguration of Mobile Lok Adalat Van

On, 14.03.2026, in a significant step towards promoting accessible justice, Hon'ble Sri Justice Vikram Nath, Judge of the Supreme Court of India, in the august presence of Hon'ble Sri Justice S.V.Bhatti, Judge, Supreme Court of India, Hon'ble Sri Justice Satish Chandra Sharma, Judge, Supreme Court of India, Hon'ble Sri Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh, Chief Justice, High Court for the State of Telangana, along with Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Executive Chairman, Telangana State Legal Services Authority and all Hon'ble Judges of the High Court for the State of Telangana, inaugurated the Mobile Lok Adalat Van, marking a milestone in expanding dispute resolution mechanisms beyond traditional court settings.

The Mobile Lok Adalat Van has been introduced to extend legal services to remote and underserved areas, providing citizens with a convenient platform to resolve their disputes amicably, expeditiously, and cost-effectively. This innovative initiative seeks



to strengthen the justice delivery system by bringing legal assistance directly to the doorsteps of those who need it most. By enhancing accessibility to dispute resolution mechanisms, the Mobile Lok Adalat Van serves as an important bridge between the judiciary and the public, fostering greater trust in the legal system and promoting the ideals of accessible, inclusive, and fair justice for all.



On 28.03.2026, National Lok Adalat was conducted all over the State of Telangana.



1st National Lok Adalat of 2026 was conducted throughout the State of Telangana under the aegis of NALSA and TSLSA and also under the leadership of Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Executive Chairman, TSLSA. Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy and Hon'ble Sri Justice N.V. Shravan Kumar, Judges, High Court for the State of Telangana actively participated in the National Lok Adalat held at the District Legal Services Authority



(DLSA), Mahabubnagar, overseeing proceedings and encouraging parties to settle their disputes amicably.

During the National Lok Adalat, a total of 11,73,919 cases were disposed of, comprising 1,20,203 pre-litigation cases and 10,53,716 pending litigation cases. An amount of ₹431,41,34,560/- approximately ₹431.41 crores, was awarded as compensation and settlement amount to the parties. The National Lok Adalat facilitated amicable resolution of disputes, thereby reducing pendency of cases and ensuring speedy and cost-effective access to justice.

SUCCESS STORIES :

✚ On 11.03.2026, the MLSC, Parakal received a petition from a lady by name Gudelli Amruthamma, W/o Late Komuraiah R/o Parakal with a request to admit her son namely Gudelli Taraswamy S/o. Late Komuraiah in Institute of Mental Health, Erragadda, Hyderabad as he is suffering physically and mentally and living at petrol pump near Parakal Bus Depot. As such the Secretary, DLSA, Warangal has discussed with Parakal Police about the issue and addressed a letter to Station House Officer, Parakal with a request to take necessary steps to take the victim to MGM Hospital, Warangal for Medical Examination and also addressed a letter to the concerned Hospital to conduct medical examination and submit report regarding his mental condition.

Accordingly, the Superintendent. MCM Hospital, Warangal took steps and conducted medical examination and submitted a report to the DLSA, stating that the said patient was examined and he is having symptoms suggestive medical illness. The Patient is aggressive, disruptive and referred to Institute of Mental Health, Erragadda, Hyderabad, for further evaluation and management. After receiving a report from the Superintendent, the patient was sent along with police escort PC.No.3166 of PS. Parkal with a request to provide admission. Accordingly, Superintendent, Institute of Mental Health" Erragadda, Hyderabad after receiving a letter on 17.03.2,026 provided admission in the hospital for Gudelli Kumaraswamy.

✚ In Pre-Litigation Case No. 275/2025, a dispute arose between Mrs. Mounika, W/o Naresh, and her brother regarding the service benefits and properties left behind by their deceased mother, who was an employee in the RWS Department. Through the intervention of the Lok Adalat, the parties amicably settled their dispute. As per the terms of the settlement, the brother agreed to pay a sum of ₹3,00,000/- (Rupees Three Lakhs only) to Mrs. Mounika towards full and final settlement of all



her claims relating to the death benefits of their deceased mother. Consequently, the matter was successfully resolved and settled before the Lok Adalat.

REGULAR LOK ADALATS:

During the period from January to March, 2026, Regular Lok Adalats were conducted and a total compensation of ₹48,09,45,549/- was awarded to the parties. During the said period, a total of 2,446 cases were settled, comprising 172 pre-litigation cases and 2,274 pending court cases..

Legal Aid Beneficiaries:

During the months of January, February and March, 2026, the Legal Services Institutions appointed 1865 Panel Advocates to the needy persons and legal advice was given to 5506 persons.

Awareness Camps :

During the period from January, 2026 to March, 2026 total 1585 Legal Awareness Camps were conducted across the State of Telangana on various legal subjects and topics to sensitize the common man.

Victim Compensation :

As per the Telangana State Victim Compensation Scheme, 2015, the Telangana State Legal Services Authority (TSLSA), Hyderabad, disbursed a total amount of ₹56,50,000/-to women and child victims, as well as the dependants of victims, in 22 cases during the period from January 2026 to March 2026. The compensation was provided for the rehabilitation and welfare of the victims and their dependants, in accordance with the provisions of the Scheme.





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

***Lok Adalats conducted and cases settled during the
period from 1st Jan, 2026 to 31st Mar, 2026***

b) Conducting Lok Adalats:

Sl. No.	Date of Lok Adalat	Number of Cases Settled	Compensation Amount
1.	28.03.2026 (National Lok Adalat)	185	10,57,63,800/-
	Total	185	10,57,63,800/-

b) Providing Legal Aid

During the period from 1st Jan, 2026 to 31st Mar, 2026, this office has provided Legal Aid and Advice/ Counseling to 344 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. 234 are such cases done by this office during the period from 1st Jan, 2026 to 31st Mar, 2026.





Telangana State Judicial Academy - Important Events

The Hon'ble High Court for the State of Telangana in collaboration with Telangana State Judicial Academy has conducted 'South Zone – II Regional Conference on 'Advance Rule of Law through Technology: Challenges and Opportunities' at Hyderabad on 14th March and 15th March, 2026.

The Regional Conference was conducted as per the programme schedule designed by National Judicial Academy, Bhopal. Total 121 participants nominated by the High Court of Tamil Nadu, High Court of Karnataka, High Court of Kerala, High Court of Andhra Pradesh and High Court for the state of Telangana have participated in the Conference.

The Inaugural Session was graced by the Hon'ble Sri Justice Vikram Nath, Judge, Supreme Court of India; Hon'ble Sri Justice Satish Chandra Sharma, Judge, Supreme Court of India; Hon'ble Sri Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh, Chief Justice, High Court for the State of Telangana; Hon'ble Sri Justice Aniruddha Bose, Director, National Judicial Academy and Hon'ble Smt. Justice Moushumi Bhattacharya, Judge, High court for the State of Telangana and President, Board of Governors, Telangana State Judicial Academy. The conference designed in 5 sessions i.e. Bridging the Digital Divide: Role of e-Services, Hon'ble Sri Justice Vikram Nath, Judge, Supreme Court of India, has chaired the session whereas Hon'ble Sri Justice Muhammed Mustaque, Chief Justice of the Sikkim High Court and Hon'ble Justice Anita Sumanth, Judge of the Madras High Court were the panelist/speakers for the session.

The Second session dealt with effective use of technology in Alternate Dispute Resolution which was chaired by Hon'ble Sri Justice Vikram Nath, Judge, Supreme Court of India, whereas Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V. Karthikeyan, Judge of the Madras High Court and Hon'ble Smt. Justice Moushumi Bhattacharya, Judge, High court for the State of Telangana were the panelist/speakers for the session.

The topic for the Third session was Electronic and Digital Media: Role of Courts the session was chaired by Hon'ble Sri Justice Satish Chandra Sharma, Judge, Supreme Court of India, whereas Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana and Ms. Monideepa Banerjee were the panelist/speakers for the session.



On 15.03.2026, the Fourth session was undertaken on the topic of Cyber-crimes and Digital Forensics which was chaired by Hon'ble Sri Justice J.K. Maheshwari, Judge, Supreme Court of India, whereas Hon'ble Sri Justice Atul Sreedharan, Judge of Allahabad High Court and Ms. Shikha Goel, DG of Police, Telangana State were the panelist/speakers for the session.

The Final session on the topic of Improving Quality of Adjudication: Emerging and Future Technologies which was chaired by Hon'ble Sri Justice J.K. Maheshwari, Judge, Supreme Court of India, whereas Hon'ble Sri Justice Soumen Sen, Chief Justice of the Kerala High Court and Hon'ble Sri Justice Suraj Govindaraj, Judge, High Court of Karnataka were the panelists/speakers for the session.



‘Constitutional Morality and Role of District Judiciary.’

The Telangana State Judicial Academy in collaboration with Telangana State Judicial Officers Association has conducted a seminar on 21.02.2026 at Telangana State Judicial Academy on the topic of ‘Constitutional Morality and Role of District Judiciary.’ Hon’ble Mr. Justice Ujjal Bhuyan, Judge, Supreme Court of India has delivered the lecture on the said topic along with Hon’ble Sri Justice Sri Aparesh Kumar Singh, Chief Justice, High Court for the State of Telangana. The Prl. District Judges and all cadres of the Judicial Officers working in the Districts of Hyderabad, Ranga Reddy and Medchal-Malkajgiri District have physically attended the seminar. Whereas remaining Judicial Officers were virtually present for the seminar.



One Day Training for all the Prl. Magistrates of the Juvenile Justice Boards and members of Juvenile Justice Boards on 31.01.2026

The Telangana State Judicial Academy in collaboration with NALSAR University of Law has conducted One Day Training for all the Prl. Magistrates of the Juvenile Justice Boards and members of Juvenile Justice Boards on 31.01.2026 at Judicial Academy. The Inaugural Session was attended by the Director of Telangana State Judicial Academy and Vice Chancellor of NALSAR University of Law.

The training session focused on the Emerging internal Jurisprudence in Juvenile Justice; Practical Process of dealing with Children in conflict with Law; Role of Prl. Magistrates and Social worker members of Juvenile Justice Board; Emerging Jurisprudence and Normative framework on Juvenile Justice Rehabilitation, Diversion, Restoration, Social investigation and Role of Probation system; Big Picture of Juvenile Justice in India and Panel Discussions on the state of Juvenile Justice after 10 years of Juvenile Justice Act. Prof. Murali Karnam, NALSAR, University of Law; Dr. Vikram



Srivastava, Advocate working on the Child rights and Sri Valay Singh from Indian Justice Report were the resource persons.



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

Telangana State Judicial Academy has also conducted Training Sessions to 07 Junior Civil Judges recruited in the year 2024 from 01.12.2025 to 28.02.2026. 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 instated otherwise on police report and Making of Documents in Civil Side.

The trainee officers have visited various public institutions from 05.01.2026 to 12.01.2026 they also underwent a training on Survey Settlement and Land Records, they also visited Telangana State Police Academy, Charlappally Jail, Anti Narcotic Bureau, Hyderabad, Central Forensic Science Laboratory in Ramanthapur. They also took training on Accounts, Pay fixation, Fundamental Rules, CCA Rules, powers of Drawing –cum- Disbursing officers.

Training Sessions to 08 Junior Civil Judges recruited in the year 2024

Telangana State Judicial Academy has also conducted Training Sessions to 08 Junior Civil Judges recruited in the year 2024 from 01.12.2025 to 28.02.2026. 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 instated otherwise on police report and Making of Documents in Civil Side.

The trainee officers have visited various public institutions from 05.01.2026 to 12.01.2026 they also underwent a training on Survey Settlement and Land Records, they also visited Telangana State Police Academy, Charlappally Jail, Anti Narcotic Bureau, Hyderabad, Central Forensic Science Laboratory in Ramanthapur. They also had taken training on Accounts; Pay fixation, Fundamental Rules, CCA Rules, powers of Drawing –cum- Disbursing officers.

Training Sessions to 05 Junior Civil Judges recruited in the year 2024

Telangana State Judicial Academy has also conducted Training Sessions to 05 Junior Civil Judges recruited in the year 2024 from 01.01.2026 to 31.03.2026 and Telangana State Judicial Academy has also conducted Training Sessions to 03 Junior Civil Judges recruited in the year 2023 from 01.12.2025 to 31.01.2026 in the month of January, 2026 training was imparted on the subject of Arrest, Remand and Custody, Scope of Advocate Commissioners, Interlocutory Applications and its disposal, Settlement of Issues, Session on Bhu Bharati Act, AI in Judiciary, cognizance under Special Act, examination under Sec. 313 of CrPC/ 351 iof BNSS, appreciation of evidence, practical approach, trial of Warrant case otherwise on Police reports.



An overview on various types of Execution petition, Maintenance and its scope under different enactment, Guidelines in the case of Rajeenesh v. Neha, Admissibility and appreciation of digital and electronic evidence, vulnerable witnesses, An analysis of marking of documents and de-exhibiting amendments to pleadings, trial in 138 NI Act, Arguments and appreciation of evidence. PITA Act, Intricacies involved in proof of



will, Law relating to wills Presumption as to documents, recording of statements of witnesses, Dowry Prohibition Act and Appreciation of Evidence vis-à-vis guidelines of Supreme Court in the Case of State of UP v. Ajmal Beg, Assignments on various types of suits, Tips on writing on docket orders, victim compensation, An overview on declaratory relief and procedures, after completion of schedule training for the II Basic Course officers and III Basic Course Officers Justice M.N. Rao Gold Medal examination was conducted. On successful completion of training a valedictory session was held on 31.03.2026.

ECT PROGRAMMES:

During this period ECT_16_2025 was undertaken on 24.01.2026 and 07.03.2026 in the 33 District Headquarters which were conducted at cluster level. Wherein, all cadres of Judicial Officers nominated to undergo training.



ECT_03_2025

During this period ECT_03_2025 was held at Telangana State Judicial Academy on 28.02.2026 and 01.03.2026 for newly appointed Master Trainers.







Inaugurations in District Courts

Laying foundation stone for construction of 10+2 Court building , at Nirmal District on 04.01.2026



Laying of foundation stone for construction of 10+2 Court building complex including Family Court and POC SO Courts Buildings at Jangaon was laid by Hon'ble Smt. Justice K. Sujana, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Administrative Judge of Nirmal District in the august presence of Hon'ble Sri Justice K. Lakshman and 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, Nirmal District, Judicial Officers and BAR Members from this District took part in the programme.



Inauguration of Junior Civil Judge-cum-Judicial Magistrate of First Class Court
at Makthal in Narayanpet District on 17.01.2026



Junior Civil Judge-cum-Judicial Magistrate of First Class Court at Makthal in Narayanpet District was inaugurated by Hon'ble Sri Justice Anil Kumar Jukanti, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Administrative Judge of Narayanpet District in the august presence of Hon'ble Smt. Justice T. Madhavi Devi, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana. The said programme was organised under the guidance of the Principle District Judge, Narayanpet District, Judicial Officers and BAR Members from this District took part in the programme.



Laying of Foundation Stone for Construction of 4 Court Building and Residential Quarters at Ramannapet in Yadadri Bhuvanagiri District on 01-02-2026



Laying of Foundation Stone for Construction of 4 Court Building and Residential Quarters at Ramannapet in Yadadri Bhuvanagiri District was laid by Hon'ble Sri Justice K. Sarath, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Administrative Judge of Yadadri Bhuvanagiri District in the august presence of Hon'ble Sri Justice P. Sam Koshy, Hon'ble Sri Justice K.Lakshman, Hon'ble Sri Justice B.Vijaysen Reddy, Hon'ble Sri Justice Narsing Rao Nandikonda, Hon'ble Sri Justice Vakiti Ramakrishna Reddy, Judges, High Court for the State of Telangana. The said programme was organised under the guidance of the Principle District Judge, Nirmal District, Judicial Officers and BAR Members from this District took part in the programme.



Inauguration of Medical Dispensary, in First Floor of the Principal District Court Complex, Suryapet District on 07.02.2026



Medical Dispensary, in First Floor of the Principal District Court Complex, Suryapet District was virtually inaugurated by Hon'ble Smt. Justice T. Madhavi Devi , Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana . The said programme was organised under the guidance of the Principle District Judge, Narayanpet District, Judicial Officers. BAR Members and Police Officials from this District took part in the programme.



Laying foundation stone for construction of 10+2 Court building ,
at Rajanna Sircilla District on 07.03.2026



Laying of foundation stone for construction of 10+2 Court building complex including Family Court and POCSO Courts Buildings at Rajanna Sircilla was virtually laid by Hon'ble Sri Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh, Chief Justice, High Court for the State of Telangana, in the august presence of Hon'ble Sri Justice N. Tukaramji, Judge, High Court for the State of Telangana & Administrative Judge of Rajanna Sircilla District, Hon'ble Sri Justice K. Lakshman, Hon'ble Sri Justice B. Vijaysen Reddy, Hon'ble Sri Justice E.V. Venugopal, Hon'ble Sri Justice Pulla Karthik, Hon'ble Sri Justice J. Sreenivas Rao and 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, Rajanna Sircilla District, Judicial Officers and BAR Members from this District took part in the programme.

