

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

**THURSDAY, THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.V.SHRAVAN KUMAR

WRIT PETITION NO: 11541 OF 2026

Between:

1. Smt.B. Reena Saxena, W/o B.Sailesh Saxena, Aged about 46 years, Occ. Housewife, Rio H.No.8-2-684/3/54, Plot No.54, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad.
2. B.Sailesh Saxena, S/o Late.B.P.Saxena, Aged about 47 years, Occ. Advocate R/o H.No.8-2-684/3/54, Plot No.54, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad.

...PETITIONERS

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Prl. Secretary, Municipal Administration and Urban Development Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation (GHMC), Lower Tank Bund, Hyderabad, Rep by its Commissioner
3. The Deputy Commissioner, GHMC Circle-36, Khairtabad, Hyderabad, Telangana
4. The Assistant City Planner, GHMC, Circle-36, Khairtabad, Hyderabad.
5. M.Gowtham Reddy, S/o M.Brahma Reddy Aged about 44 years R/o H.No. 357, Road No. 80,PhaseIII, Jubilee Hills Hyderabad.
6. Amar Tibrewal, S/o Kishan Tibrewal aged about 55 years, Occ. Business R/o 8-2-684/3/52 and 8-2-684/3/53 (Old Rear side of Road No. 12, Banjarahills , Hyderabad
7. Archana, W/o Amar Tibrewal , aged about 49 years, OCC.housewife, R/o R/o 8-2684/3/52 and 8-2-684/3/53 (Old Rear side of Road No. 12, Banjarahills , Hyderabad.
8. M.Godha Reddy, W/o Praveen Reddy aged about 43 years, Occ.Business, R/o Plot NO.130,Road No.15,Prashasan Nagar, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad
9. Ratna Gulabrai Vatnani, w/o Gulabrai Vatnani aged about 65 years, Occ.House wife R/o 8-2-684/3/52 and 8-2-684/3/53 Old Rear side of Road No. 12, Banjarahills , Hyderabad.

10. Gulabrai Vatnani, S/o Teoomal Vatnani Aged about 65 years Occ.Business R/o 8-2-684/3/52 and 8-2-684/3/53 (Old Rear side of Road No. 12, Banjarahills, Hyderabad.
11. C.Amarnath, S/o Late C. Balkishan Aged about 64 years, R/o 3-6-58/8/25/1/A, Avanthi Nagar, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad.
12. Zuhooruddin Syed Madani, S/o Syed Tajuddin Madani, Aged about 56 years, R/o 12-2-330/B/2, Murad Mahal, Asif Nagar, Hyderabad.
13. Mrs. Mahmooda Sultana, W/o Syed Tajuddin, aged about 65 years, Occ. Business, R/o H.No. 12-2-330/B/2, Mehdipatnam, Hyderabad
14. Syed Tajuddin Madani, S/o Late Syed Zahooruddin Madani, Aged about 72 years, Occ.Business, R/o H.No.12-2-330/B/2, Mehdipatnam, Hyderabad.
15. Mr. Zahooruddin Syed Madani, S/o Mr. Syed Tajuddin Madani Aged about 45 years, Occupation. Business R/o H. No. 12-2-330/B/2 Murad Nagar, Asifnagar, Humayan Nagar, Hyderabad -28
16. Anwari begum, W/o Syed Zahooruddin Madhani aged about 76 years, Occ. Retired Service R/o H.No. 8-1-523/267, Brindavan Colony, Toli Chowki, Hyderabad.
17. C.Veena, D/o C.Amarnath aged about 37 years, Occ.Housewife, R/o H.No. 3-6-69/B/25/1, Avanthinagax, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to Issue a Writ order or direction , more particularly a Writ of Mandamus, declaring the inaction of the Respondents Authorities in not demolishing the illegal and unauthorised constructions made by the unofficial respondents no. 5 to 17 in the Plot No 52 and 53 bearing house No. 8-2-684/3/52 and 8-2-684/3/53 (Old plot No. 52 and 53 in survey No. 129/53 situated at Rear side of Road No. 12, street No.5, Banjara Green Colony, Banjarahills, Hyderabad without considering the Representations dated. 6-10-2025, 15-12-2025, 29-01-2026, 13-03-2026 of the petitioners as illegal, arbitrary and contrary to the Principles of Natural justice and also violative of Articles 14, 19, 21 and 300-A of Constitution of India and consequently Direct the Respondent No. 1 to 4 to demolish the illegal and unauthorized constructions made by the unofficial respondents 5 to 17 being carried out at Plot No 52 and 53 bearing house No. 8-2-684/3/52 and 8-2-684/3/53 (Old plot No. 52 and 53 in survey No. 129/53 situated at Rear side of Road No. 12, street No.5, Banjara Green Colony, Banjarahills, Hyderabad immediately by considering the representations of the petitioners dated 26-10-2025, 15-12-2025, 29-01-2026, 13-03-2026 in the interest of justice.

I.A.NO:1 OF 2026

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 direct the Respondent No. 1 to 4 to demolish the illegal and unauthorized constructions made by the unofficial respondents 5 to 17 being carried out at Plot No 52 and 53 bearing house No. 8-2-684/3/52 and 8-2-684/3/53 (Old plot No. 52 and 53 in survey No. 129/53 situated at Rear side of Road No. 12, street No.5, Banjara Green Colony, Banjarahills, Hyderabad immediately by considering the representations of the petitioners dated. 26-10-2025, 15-12-2025, 29-01-2026, 13-03-2026, pending disposal of main writ petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner : SRI. ABDUL RAB MALIK

Counsel for the Respondent No.1 : AGP FOR MCPL ADMN AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.2 to 4 : SRI MIDDE ARUN KUMAR, SC FOR GHMC

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.5 to 17 : --

The Court made the following ORDER

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT
HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.V.SHRAVAN KUMAR

WRIT PETITION No.11541 of 2026

DATE OF ORDER: 16.04.2026

Between:

Smt. B.Reena Saxena and another.

...Petitioners

AND

The State of Telangana, rep. by its Principal Secretary, Municipal
Administration and Urban Development Department and others.

...Respondents

ORDER:

Heard Sri Abdul Rab Malik, learned counsel for the petitioners,
learned Government Pleader for MA&UD appearing for respondent No.1 and
Sri Midde Arun Kumar, learned Standing Counsel for GHMC appearing for
respondent Nos.2 to 4. With their consent, the writ petition is being taken up
for disposal at the admission stage itself.

2. This writ petition has been filed seeking the following prayer:-

"...declaring the inaction of the respondents authorities in not demolishing the illegal and unauthorized constructions made by the unofficial respondents no. 5 to 17 in the Plot Nos. 52 and 53 bearing house No. 8-2-684/3/52 and 8-2-684/3/53 (Old plot Nos. 52 and 53 in survey No. 129/53 situated at Rear side of Road No. 12, street No.5, Banjara Green Colony, Banjara hills , Hyderabad without considering the Representations dated 26-10-2025, 15-12-2025, 29-01-2026, 13-03-2026 of the petitioners as illegal, arbitrary and contrary to the Principles of Natural justice and also violative of Articles 14, 19, 21 and 300-A of Constitution of India and consequently direct respondent Nos. 1 to 4 to demolish the illegal and unauthorized constructions made by the unofficial respondent Nos.5 to 17 being carried out at Plot Nos.52 and 53 bearing house No. 8-2-684/3/52 and 8-2-684/3/53 (Old plot Nos. 52 and 53 in survey No. 129/53 situated at Rear side of Road No. 12, street No.5, Banjara Green Colony, Banjara hills , Hyderabad immediately by considering the representations of the petitioners dated 26-10-2025, 15-12-2025, 29-01-2026, 13-03-2026..."

3. Brief facts of the case as stated are that the petitioners claims to be the owners and possessors of the land admeasuring 340.69 Sq.Yards of H.No.8-2-684/3/54, Plot No.54 in Survey No.129/53 situated at Road No.12, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad, having purchased the same *vide* through registered sale deed bearing document No.3738 of 2014 dated 29.09.2014. It is submitted that the neighbours of the southern side i.e., respondent Nos.5 to 17 constructed illegal compound wall within the petitioners premises and are also carrying out unauthorized construction on Plot Nos.52 and 53 (Old plot Nos.52 and 53 in Survey No.129/53) situated at Rear side of Road No.12, Street No.5, Banjara Green Colony, Banjara Hills , Hyderabad. In view of the same, the petitioners submitted their representations dated 26.10.2025, 15.12.2025, 29.01.2026 and 13.03.2026 respectively. However, no action has been taken. Questioning the same, the present writ petition is filed.

4. The learned Standing Counsel for GHMC appearing for respondent Nos.2 to 4 submits that if the petitioners' representations dated 26.10.2025, 15.12.2025, 29.01.2026, 13.03.2026, are still pending for consideration, the respondent authorities would consider the same and take action in accordance with law.

5. In the case on hand, it is pertinent to refer to Section 7(6) of the Telangana State Building Permission Approval and Self Certification System (TS-BPASS) Act, 2020 (for short 'the TS-BPASS Act'), the same are extracted hereunder:-

"7. Approval of Building Permissions-

(6) Citizens shall be encouraged to bring to the notice of Municipality and District Collector cases where unauthorized construction or construction in violation of or in excess of permissions, in the manner prescribed. The identity of such informers shall be kept confidential. All such cases shall be examined within a week from such information and appropriate action initiated. The information shall be incentivized in all such cases where the information, furnished by him is found to be correct."

6. For better appreciation, this Court deems it appropriate to refer some of the relevant Sections of Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation Act, 1955 (hereinafter referred to as 'the GHMC Act').

Section 428 of the GHMC Act, 1955

428. Notice to be given to commissioner of intention to erect a building: (1) Every person who intends to erect a building shall give to the commissioner notice of his said intention in a form, obtained for this purpose under Section 435, specifying the position of the building intended to be erected, the description of building, the purpose for which it is intended, its dimensions and the name of the person whom he intends to employ to supervise its erection.

Section 433 of GHMC Act, 1955

433. Notice to be given to the Commissioner of intention to make additions, etc., :-
"Every person who shall intend.

(a) to make any addition to a building; or

(b) to make any alteration or repairs to a building; not being a frame-building, involving the removal or re-erection of any external or party-wall thereof or of any wall which supports the roof thereof, to an extent exceeding one-half of such wall above the plinth level, such half to be measured in superficial feet; or

(c) to make any alteration or repairs to a frame-building, involving the removal or

re-erection of more than one-half of the posts in any such wall thereof as aforesaid or involving the removal or re-erection of any such wall thereof as aforesaid to an extent exceeding one-half of such wall above the plinth level, such half to be measured in superficial feet; or

(d) to make any alteration in a building involving:—

(i) the sub-division of any room in such building so as to convert the same into two or more separate rooms.

(ii) the conversion of any passage or space in such building into a room or rooms; or

(e) to remove or reconstruct any portion of a building abutting on a street which stands within the regular line of such street; shall give to the Commissioner in a form obtained for the purpose under section 435 notice of his intention, specifying the portion of the building in which such work is to be executed, the nature and extent of the intended work, the particular part or parts, if any, of such work which is or are intended to be used for human habitation and the name of the person whom he intends to employ to supervise its execution."

Section 451 of GHMC Act, 1955

"451. Inspection of buildings in course of erection, alteration etc.:- The Commissioner may at any time during the erection or re-erection of a building or the execution of any such work as is described in Section 433 make an inspection thereof without giving previous notice of his intention so to do."

Section 452 of GHMC Act, 1955

452. Demolition or alteration of the building work unlawfully commenced, carried on or completed and appeal thereon:- (1) If the Commissioner is satisfied that the construction or re-construction of any building or execution of any work as described in Section 433 is commenced or carried out contrary to the provisions of the Act or building rules or bye-laws made thereunder, he shall make a provisional order requiring the person who is constructing or re-constructing such building or executing such work or has constructed or re-constructed such building or

executed such work to demolish such unauthorized construction or re-construction or work within a period specified to bring such construction or re-construction of the building or work in conformity with the provisions of the Act or building rules or Bye-laws made thereunder and may also direct that until the said order is complied with, the concerned person shall refrain from proceeding with such construction or reconstruction of the building or work.

Section 456 of GHMC Act, 1955

"Dangerous Structures"

Removal of structures, trees etc., which are in ruins or likely to fall:- (1) If it shall at any time appear to the Commissioner that any structure (including under this expression any building, wall, parapet, pavement, floor, steps, railings, door or window frames or shutters or roof, or other structure and anything affixed to or projection from or resting on, any building, wall, parapet or other structure) is in ruinous condition or likely to fall, or is in any way dangerous to any person occupying, resorting to or passing by, such structure or any other structure or place in the neighbourhood thereof, the Commissioner may, by written notice, require the owner or occupier of such structure to do one or more of the following things, namely:—

- (i) to pull down,
- (ii) to secure,
- (iii) to remove, or
- (iv) to repair such structure or thing, and to prevent all cause of danger therefrom.

(2) The Commissioner may also, if he thinks fit, require the said owner or occupier by the said notice, either forthwith or before proceedings to pull down, secure, remove or repair the structure or things, to set up a proper and sufficient hoard or fence for the protection of passers-by and other persons, with a convenient platform and hand-rail, if there be room enough for the same the Commissioner shall think the same desirable, to serve as footway for passengers outside of such hoard or fence.

(3) If it appears to the Commissioner that the danger from a structure which is ruinous or about to fall is imminent, he may, before giving notice as aforesaid or before the period of notice expires,

fence off, take down, secure or repair the said structure or take such steps or cause work to be executed as may be required to arrest the danger.

(4) Any expenses incurred by the Commissioner under sub-section (3) shall be paid by the owner or occupier of the structure.

(5) (a) Where the Commissioner is of opinion whether on receipt of an application or otherwise that the only or the most convenient means by which the owner or occupier of structure such as is referred to in sub-section (1) can pull down, secure, remove or repair such structure, is by entering any of the adjoining premises belonging to some other person the Commissioner after giving such person a reasonable opportunity of stating any objection may, if no such objection is raised or if any objection which is raised appears to him invalid or insufficient, by an order in writing, authorise the said owner or occupier to enter such adjoining premises.

(b) Every such order bearing the signature of the Commissioner shall be a sufficient authority to the person in whose favour it is made, or to any agent or person employed by him for this purpose, after giving to the owner of the premises reasonable written notice of his intention so to do, to enter upon the said premises with assistants and workmen, at any time between sunrise and sun set, and to execute the necessary work.

(c) In executing, any work under this section as little damage as possible shall be done to the adjoining owner's property, and the owner or occupier of premises for the benefit of which the work is done, shall —

(i) cause the work to be executed with the least practicable delay;

(ii) pay compensation to any person who sustains damage by the execution of the said work.

Section 461-A of GHMC Act, 1955

"461-A. Powers to seal unauthorized construction/development of premises:-

(1) It shall be lawful for the Commissioner, at any time, before or after making an order for the removal or discontinuance of any unauthorized development or construction under section 461, to make an order directing the sealing of such development or property or

taking the assistance of police, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Act."

Section 636 of GHMC Act, 1955

"636. Work or thing done without written permission of the Commissioner to be deemed unauthorized:- (1) If any work or thing requiring the written permission of the Commissioner under any provision of this Act, or any rule, regulation or bye-law is done by any person without obtaining such written permission or, if such written permission is subsequently suspended or revoked for any reason by the Commissioner, such work or thing shall be deemed to be unauthorised and subject to any other provision of this Act the Commissioner may at any time, by written notice, require that the same shall be removed, pulled down or undone as the case may be, by the person so carrying out or doing if the person carrying out such work or doing such thing is not the owner at the time of such notice then the owner at the time of giving such notice shall be liable for carrying out the requisitions of the Commissioner.

(2) If within the period specified in such written notice the requisitions contained therein are not carried out by the person or owner, as the case may be, the Commissioner may remove or alter such work or undo such thing and the expenses thereof shall be paid by such person or owner as the case may be."

7. On perusal of the above provisions, it is clear that the respondent authorities are vested with statutory powers to inspect any property and after putting on notice and after giving fair opportunity of hearing to the concerned parties, may take appropriate action against the unauthorized constructions on such properties, in accordance with law.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Shanti Sports Club and Ors. Vs. Union of India (UOI) and Ors*¹, held that violators of the Town Planning Scheme cannot be granted any relief. The relevant observations are as under:

"52. Before concluding, we consider it necessary to enter a caveat. In all developed countries, great emphasis has been laid on the planned development of cities and urban areas. The object of planned development has been achieved by rigorous enforcement of master plans prepared after careful study of complex issues, scientific research and rationalisation of laws. The people of those countries have greatly contributed to the concept of planned development of cities by strictly adhering to the planning laws, the master plan etc. They respect the laws enacted by the legislature for regulating planned development of the cities and seldom there is a complaint of violation of master plan etc. in the construction of buildings, residential, institutional or commercial.

In contrast, scenario in the developing countries like ours is substantially different. Though, the competent legislatures have, from time to time, enacted laws for ensuring planned development of the cities and urban areas, enforcement thereof has been extremely poor and the people have violated the master plans, zoning plans and building regulations and bye-laws with impunity. In last four decades, almost all cities, big or small, have seen unplanned growth. In the 21st century, the menace of illegal and unauthorized constructions and encroachments has acquired monstrous proportions and everyone has been paying heavy price for the same. Economically affluent people and those having support of the political and executive apparatus of the State have constructed buildings, commercial complexes, multiplexes, malls etc. in blatant violation of the municipal and town planning laws, master plans, zonal development plans and even the sanctioned building plans. In most of the cases of illegal or unauthorized constructions, the officers of the municipal and other regulatory bodies turn blind eye either due to the influence of higher functionaries of the State or other extraneous reasons. Those who construct buildings in violation of the relevant statutory provisions, master plan etc. and those who directly or indirectly abet such violations are totally unmindful of the grave consequences of their actions and/or omissions on the present as well

¹ ((2009) 15 SCC 705)

as future generations of the country which will be forced to live in unplanned cities and urban areas. The people belonging to this class do not realize that the constructions made in violation of the relevant laws, master plan or zonal development plan or sanctioned building plan or the building is used for a purpose other than the one specified in the relevant statute or the master plan etc., such constructions put unbearable burden on the public facilities/amenities like water, electricity, sewerage etc. apart from creating chaos on the roads. The pollution caused due to traffic congestion affects the health of the road users. The pedestrians and people belonging to weaker sections of the society, who cannot afford the luxury of air-conditioned cars, are the worst victims of pollution. They suffer from skin diseases of different types, asthma, allergies and even more dreaded diseases like cancer. It can only be a matter of imagination how much the government has to spend on the treatment of such persons and also for controlling pollution and adverse impact on the environment due to traffic congestion on the roads and chaotic conditions created due to illegal and unauthorized constructions. This Court has, from time to time, taken cognizance of buildings constructed in violation of municipal and other laws and emphasized that no compromise should be made with the town planning scheme and no relief should be given to the violator of the town planning scheme etc. on the ground that he has spent substantial amount on construction of the buildings etc. - K. Ramdas Shenoy v. Chief Officers, Town Municipal Council, Udipi 1974 (2) SCC 506, Dr. G.N. Khajuria v. Delhi Development Authority 1995 (5) SCC 762, M.I. Builders Pvt. Ltd. v. Radhey Shyam Sahu 1999 (6) SCC 464, Friends Colony Development Committee v. State of Orissa 2004 (8) SCC 733, M.C. Mehta v. Union of India 2006 (3) SCC 399 and S.N. Chandrasekhar v. State of Karnataka 2006 (3) SCC 208.

53. Unfortunately, despite repeated judgments by the this Court and High Courts, the builders and other affluent people engaged in the construction activities, who have, over the years shown scant respect for regulatory mechanism envisaged in the municipal and other similar laws, as also the master plans, zonal development plans, sanctioned plans etc., have received encouragement and support from the State apparatus. As and when the courts have passed orders or the officers of local and other bodies have taken action for ensuring rigorous compliance of laws relating to planned development of the cities and urban areas and issued directions for

demolition of the illegal/unauthorized constructions, those in power have come forward to protect the wrong doers either by issuing administrative orders or enacting laws for regularization of illegal and unauthorized constructions in the name of compassion and hardship. Such actions have done irreparable harm to the concept of planned development of the cities and urban areas. It is high time that the executive and political apparatus of the State take serious view of the menace of illegal and unauthorized constructions and stop their support to the lobbies of affluent class of builders and others, else even the rural areas of the country will soon witness similar chaotic conditions. " (Emphasis supplied).

22. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Esha Ekta Apartments Co-operative Housing Society Ltd. and Ors. Vs. Municipal Corporation of Mumbai and Ors** (2013) 5 SCC 357, held that Constitutional Courts ought not to exercise their equitable jurisdiction to regularize illegal and unauthorized constructions. The relevant observations are as under:

"45. In view of the above discussion, we hold that the Petitioners in the transferred case have failed to make out a case for directing the Respondents to regularize the construction made in violation of the sanctioned plan. Rather, the ratio of the above-noted judgments and, in particular, *Royal Paradise Hotel (P) Ltd. v. State of Haryana and Ors.* (supra) is clearly attracted in the present case. **We would like to reiterate that no authority administering municipal laws and other similar laws can encourage violation of the sanctioned plan. The Courts are also expected to refrain from exercising equitable jurisdiction for regularization of illegal and unauthorized constructions else it would encourage violators of the planning laws and destroy the very idea and concept of planned development of urban as well as rural areas.**" (emphasis supplied)"

9. It is also relevant to refer to the orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Writ Petition (Civil) No.295 of 2022 (2024 INSC 866) (Bulldozer's Case), wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court gave certain directions and guidelines to the Government for manner of proceeding in demolition of the unauthorized construction.

10. Since the provisions of the GHMC Act, 1955 mandates issuance of notice to the persons concerned and the GHMC authorities are empowered to examine and decide the issue with respect to unauthorized constructions, by issuing notice to the concerned parties, the respondent authorities are directed to issue notice to the concerned parties. As such, in the present case, issuance of notice to respondent Nos.5 to 17 is dispensed with.

11. Having considered the above facts and circumstance, recording the submission made by the learned counsel appearing on either side, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case and after considering judicial precedents referred to hereinabove, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition directing the respondent authorities to consider the petitioners' representations dated 26.10.2025, 15.12.2025, 29.01.2026, 13.03.2026 and after giving fair opportunity of hearing to petitioners and respondent Nos.5 to 17, shall pass appropriate orders strictly in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of four (04) weeks, from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and communicate the same to the petitioners. It is made clear that if the allegations made by the petitioners are found to be true, the respondent authorities shall take appropriate action strictly in accordance with law.

12. It is clarified that in the event of respondent Nos.5 to 17 are otherwise aggrieved may avail remedy of filing application for the modification of this order, in accordance with law.

13. With the above directions, this writ petition is disposed of. Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed. No order as to costs.

//TRUE COPY//

SD/- A .JAYASREE
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

SECTION OFFICER

To

1. The Principal Secretary, Municipal Administration and Urban Development Department, Secretariat, State of Telangana at Hyderabad.
2. The Commissioner, Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation (GHMC), Lower Tank Bund, Hyderabad.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, GHMC Circle-36, Khairtabad, Hyderabad, Telangana
4. The Assistant City Planner, GHMC, Circle-36, Khairtabad, Hyderabad.
5. Two CCs to GP FOR MCPL ADMN AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad. [OUT]
6. One CC to SRI ABDUL RAB MALIK, Advocate [OPUC]
7. One CC to SRI MIDDE ARUN KUMAR, SC FOR GHMC, Advocate (OPUC)
8. Two CD Copies

SA
TKS



C.C. TODAY

HIGH COURT

DATED: 16/04/2026



ORDER

WP.No.11541 of 2026

**DISPOSING OF THE W.P
AT THE STAGE OF ADMISSION
WITHOUT COSTS.**

11/5/26
28/4/26