HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THURSDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF AUGUST
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE G.M. MOHIUDDIN

WRIT APPEAL NO: 848 OF 2025

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent preferred against the Order dated 24/07/2025 passed in W. P. No.20633 of 2025 on the file of the High Court.

Between:

1. M/s S.R.S.K. Developers, Rep. By. Sattor Kistaiah @ Sattor Kistappa S/o. Sattor Narayana Aged 73 years, Occ.Business, O/o. H.No.31-270, Gauri Shankar Colony, Badepally, Jadcherla, Mahbubnagar Dist., Telangana - 506 101.
2. Sattor Kistaiah @ Sattor Kistappa, S/o. Sattor Narayana Aged about 72 years,years, Occ.Business, R/o. H.No.31-270, Gauri Shankar Colony, Badepally, Jadcherla, Mahbubnagar Dist., Telangana - 506 101

...APPELLANTS

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Municipal Administration and Urban Development, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. Mahbubnagar Urban Development Authority (MUDA), Rep. by its. Chairman, Near Panchayat Office, Christianpally, Mahbubnagar
3. The Chairman, Mahbubnagar Urban Development Authority (MUDA) Near Panchayat Office, Christianpally, Mahbubnagar
4. The Vice Chairman, Mahbubnagar Urban Development Authority (MUDA) Near Panchayat Office, Christianpally, Mahbubnagar.
5. Satoor Ramachandraiah Goud, S/o. Late Satoor Vijay Kumar, Aged about 48 years, Occ. Private Employee, H.No. 1-2-54/5, Sutnitra sadan, Street No.6, Domalguda, Hyderabad-500029.
6. Satoor Purushotham Goud, S/o. Late S.Ramalingam Goud, Age. 58 years, Occ. Business, R/o. H.No.5-6-113/A, Near District Jail, Old Palamoor, Mahabubnagar.
7. Satoor Ramesh Goud, S/o. Late S.Ramalingam Goud, Age. 55 years, Occ. Business, R/o. H.No.B-28/, F/3, Vignanpuri Colony, Housing Board Colony, Nallakunta, Vidyanagar, Hyderabad.

...RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS

8. Sattoor Ramesh Goud, S/o.Late Shankaraiah Goud, Aged about 57 years, Occ. Private Employee, R/o.H.No.52/ 1, Old Palamoor, Mahabubnagar.

...IMPLEAD RESPONDENT

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay the proceedings dated 07-07-2025 in File No.95/2025/MUDA/MBNR issued by the respondent No.4 herein, pending disposal of the writ appeal.

Counsel for the Appellants: SRI Y.SOMA SRINATH REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: SRI K.MAHESH,
AGP FOR MCPL ADMN & URBAN DEV

Counsel for the Respondent No.2 to 4: SRI KRISHNA REDDY PUTTA,
SC FOR MCPL

Counsel for the Respondent No.5: SRI I.RAMESH

Counsel for the Respondent No.6: Ms. B.L.KANAKAVALLI

Counsel for the Respondent No.8: SRI M.RAM MOHAN REDDY

The Court delivered the following: JUDGMENT

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.M.MOHIUDDIN

WRIT APPEAL No.848 of 2025

JUDGMENT:

Heard Sri Y.Soma Srinath Reddy, learned counsel for the appellants. Also heard Sri K.Mahesh, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Municipal Administration and Urban Development Department, appearing for respondent No.1; Sri Krishna Reddy Putta, learned Standing Counsel for Municipalities, appearing for respondent Nos.2 to 4; Sri I.Ramesh, learned counsel for respondent No.5; Ms. B.L.Kanakavalli, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.6; and Sri M.Ram Mohan Reddy, learned counsel for respondent No.8.

2. This writ appeal is directed against the interim order dated 24.07.2025 passed in W.P.No.20633 of 2025, which was filed by the appellants herein (hereinafter referred to as, "the writ petitioners").

3. The layout permission granted to the writ petitioners was revoked by order dated 07.07.2025 by the Mahabubnagar Urban Development Authority (MUDA). Being aggrieved, the writ petition was preferred. The learned writ court passed a conditional order in the following terms:

> "In the opinion of this Court, even if pendency of the suit in O.S.No.100 of 2022 was disclosed by the petitioners, it would not have any bearing on the lay out permission since there was no interim injunction order passed in the suit. Thus, until any interim injunction order or prohibitory order is passed by the trial Court, there was no embargo on respondent No.2 to process the layout application and ultimately grant approval. It would not be in the interest of justice to continue the impugned proceedings for an indefinite period even if there is no injunction/prohibitory order.
>
> In the circumstances, the trial Court is directed to dispose of I.A.No.1310 of 2024 in O.S.No.25 of 2024 or any other pending application within (6) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. If any prohibitory or injunction order is passed in O.S.No.100 of 2022, the impugned order dated 07.07.2025 shall continue. However, if I.A.No.1310 of 2024 or any other application is dismissed, the impugned order dated 07.07.2025 shall stand automatically suspended."

4. It transpires from the submission of the learned counsel for the parties that the subject land over which the layout permission has been granted is the subject matter of O.S.No.100 of 2022 filed for declaration of title and possession over the subject land. The reason for revocation is suppression of this fact to the MUDA. Therefore, the learned writ court thought it proper to direct the trial court to dispose of I.A.No.1310 of 2024 pending in O.S.No.25 of 2024 or any other pending application within six weeks from the date of receipt of the interim order. If any prohibitory or injunction order is passed, the order of revocation dated 07.07.2025 would continue. If the interlocutory application or any other application is dismissed, the order of revocation shall stand automatically suspended.

5. We understand that the learned writ court has taken the safeguard, since the parties are involved in the civil suit over the same subject land. The writ petition is pending. There is a clear timeline for the trial court to dispose of such application.

6. In the above circumstances, we do not find any reason to interfere with the impugned interim order. We leave it to the parties to raise such grounds of law and facts in the pending writ proceedings which may be considered in accordance with law expeditiously.

7. The instant appeal is accordingly disposed of. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

SD/-K. AMMAJI
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Secretary, Municipal Administration and Urban Development, Secretariat, Hyderabad, State of Telangana.
2. The Chairman, Mahbubnagar Urban Development Authority (MUDA), Near Panchayat Office, Christianpally, Mahbubnagar
3. The Chairman, Mahbubnagar Urban Development Authority (MUDA) Near Panchayat Office, Christianpally, Mahbubnagar
4. The Vice Chairman, Mahbubnagar Urban Development Authority (MUDA) Near Panchayat Office, Christianpally, Mahbubnagar.
5. One CC to SRI Y.SOMA SRINATH REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
6. One CC to Ms. B.L.KANAKAVALLI, Advocate [OPUC]
7. One CC to SRI I.RAMESH, Advocate [OPUC]
8. One CC to SRI M.RAM MOHAN REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
9. One CC to SRI KRISHNA REDDY PUTTA, SC FOR MCPL [OPUC]
10. Two CCs to GP FOR MCPL ADMN URBAN DEV, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad [OUT]
11. Two CD Copies

BSR

HIGH COURT

DATED: 07/08/2025

JUDGMENT

WA.No.848 of 2025



DISPOSING OF THE WRIT APPEAL, WITHOUT COSTS

PA

14/8/25