

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

**WRIT PETITION Nos.39962, 40727 & 41320 OF 2016**

**DATED : 28.11.2016**

Between :

D. Padmanabha Reddy S/o.Sanjeeva Reddy,  
Age 47 yrs, Occu : Business,  
R/o.H.No.8-3-27/7, Mettugadda,  
Mahabubnagar, Mahabubnagar District  
Telangana State

..  
Petitioner

And

The State of Telangana,  
Rep., by its Principal Secretary,  
Dep by Municipal Administration,  
Secretariat, Hyderabad & another.

..  
Respondents



This court made the following :

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

**WRIT PETITION Nos.39962, 40727 & 41320 OF 2016**

**COMMON ORDER :**

Petitioners are aggrieved by the order dated 10.11.2016 and 14.11.2016 respectively, rejecting application for regularizing the unauthorized/illegal constructions made by them, on the shortfalls noticed by the competent authority as listed out in the said proceedings.

2. When the matters are taken up for consideration, learned Standing counsel and the learned Government Pleader raised objection on the maintainability of the writ petitions as the petitioners have an effective and efficacious remedy by way of appeal under Rule 11 of Telangana Regularisation of Unauthorisedly constructed buildings and buildings constructed in deviation of the sanctioned plan Rules, 2015 (for short 'the Rules'), notified vide G.O.Ms.No.152 dated 02.11.2015.

3. Rule 11 of the Rules reads as under :

***“Any applicant aggrieved by an order passed by the Competent Authority under Rule 6, may prefer an appeal to the Committee constituted by the Government, within thirty days from the date of receipt of the order provided the applicant has paid the necessary charges and submitted documents as specified in Rule 3 and 5 of these rules.”***

4. Learned Government Pleader produced orders of the Government in G.O.Ms.141, dated 17.05.2016 whereby the appellate authority is constituted.

5. It is not the case of the petitioners that the appeal provision incorporated in the Rules is not effective or efficacious remedy.

Hence, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petitions, when the petitioners have an effective and efficacious remedy created by the statute, whereunder application for building regularization is processed.

6. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners may be granted 15 days time to prefer appeal as provided in Rule 11 of the Rules and till the appeal is preferred, the respondents may be directed not to take any coercive steps against the petitioners.

7. Learned Standing counsel would submit that under the guise of application for building permission, the petitioners are undertaking further construction.

8. Having regard to these submissions and in view of the earlier undertaking filed before the Municipality, the respondent-Municipality shall not take any coercive action against the petitioners for a period of 15 days from today. However, it shall ensure that no further construction can be taken up by the petitioners till their appeal is considered and disposed of by the appellate authority.

9. Leaving it open to the petitioners to avail the remedy of appeal as provided under Rule 11 of the Rules, these writ petitions are dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in these writ petitions shall stand closed.

**P.NAVEEN RAO,J**

28<sup>th</sup> November, 2016

Note : Issue c.c. in two days.

B/o.  
Rds