

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD
AT HYDERABAD**

**THURSDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K.LAKSHMAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India aggrieved by the Orders dated 17.12.2025 passed in I.A.No 1896 of 2025 in A.OP.No 184 of 2022 on the file of the XI Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court at Hyderabad.

Between:

1. M/s. IRA Square Township LLP., Represented by its Designated Partner, Sri Posham Narsi Reddy, S/o. Posham Venkat Reddy, O/o. H.No 4-49/2, Vattinagulapally Village, Gandipet Mandal, Rangareddy District.
2. Sri Posham Narsi Reddy, S/o. Posham Venkat Reddy, aged 45 years, occ:Business, O/o. H.No 4-49/2, Vattinagulapally Village, Gandipet Mandal, Rangareddy District.

...PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS

AND

1. Sri Amir Shareef, S/o. Ghouse Hareef Aged about 23 years, Occ:Education, R/o. H.No 22-3-465, Miralam Mandi Charminar, Hyderabad.
2. Sri Syed Kallemullah Hussaini, S/o. Syed Kareemullah Hussaini Aged about 30 years, Occ:Business, R/o. H.No 6-3-252/a143/1, Erramanzil, Azmaah Bandur Nagar, Kairatabad, Hyderabad.
3. Sri Syed Saifuddin, S/o. Syed Yosuf Uddin Aged about 30 years, Occ:Business, R/o. H.No 22-3-540/1, Mir Alam Mandi, Mir Chowk Zehara Nagar, Charminar, Hyderabad.
4. Sri Syed Osman, S/o. Late Syed Baban Aged about 74 years, Occ:Business, R/o. H.No 22-3-540/1, Mir Alam Mandi, Mir Chowk Zehara Nagar, Charminar, Hyderabad.(Died on 24.09.2025)the legal heirs have been on record in the arbitration proceedings ARB CASE No 8 of 2024 pending on the file of Hon'ble Former Justice Sri A.Rajashekar Reddy.

...RESPONDENTS/PETITIONERS

5. Mr.Namireddy Raghuram Reddy, S/o. Sri Seetharam Reddy, aged about 52 years, Occ:Business, R/o. H.No 18-111, Kamalnagar, Dilshuknagar, Hyderabad.
6. Mr. Namireddy Rajaram reddy, S/o. Seetharam Reddy, aged about 51 years, Occ:Business, R/o.H.No 18-111, Kamalnagar, Dilshuknagar, Hyderabad.
7. Sri Posham Kiran Kumar Reddy, S/o. Sri P.Dharma Reddy, aged about 51 years, Occ:Business, R/o. H.No 17-1-383/M31, Vinay Nagar Colony Saidabad, Hyderabad. (R5 to R7 Not Necessary parties in this petition)
8. Sri Syed Irfan Sulaiman, S/o. Late Syed Osman, aged about 36 years, Occ:Private employment R/o. 6-3-252/A/43/1, Erranzil, Khirathabad, Hyderabad.
9. Sri Syed Rehaman, S/o. Late Syed Osman, aged about 33 years, Occ:Private employment R/o. 16-2-565, 2d Lane Platan, Malalkpet, Hyderabad, 500036
10. Sri Syed Dawood, S/o. S/o. Late Syed Osman, aged about 36 years, Occ:Private employment R/o. 16-2-660, Platan, Malakpet, Amberpet, Hyderabad, 500036 (LRS of 4TH Respondent Syed Osman) (R5 to R10 Not Necessary parties in this petition)

...RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS

I.A. No. 3 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 Suspend the operation of the Order dated 17.12.2025 in I.A.No.1896 of 2025 in A.OP.No.184 of 2022 on the file of XI Additional Chief Judge City Civil Court at Hyderabad, and treat the existing deposit of Rs.6,00,00,000/- in State Bank of India as interim security to the satisfaction of this Hon'ble Court pending disposal of the above C.R.P. and pass.

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 grant leave to the petitioners to present civil revision petition against the order dated 17.12.2025 in I.A. No.1896 of 2025 in AOP No.184 of 2022 on the file of XI Additional Chief Judge City Civil court at Hyderabad, by showing the LRS of 4th respondent i.e., Syed Osman as Respondents Nos.8 to 10 and pass.

Counsel for the Petitioner(s): Ms. Madhavi Priya Mantena

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 to 7: None appeared

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.8 to 10: T. Bala Mohan Reddy

The Court made the following: ORDER

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K. LAKSHMAN
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VAKITI RAMAKRISHNA REDDY**

Civil Revision Petition No.1 of 2026

Date: 22.01.2026

Between:

M/s.Ira Square Township LLP,
Rep. by its Designated Partner
Sri Posham Narsi Reddy and another.

...Petitioners

And

Sri Amir Shareef and others.

...Respondents

ORDER: *(Per Hon'ble Sri Justice K.Lakshman)*

Heard Sri Raja Gopallavan Tayi, learned counsel representing Ms.Madhavi Priya Mantena, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri T.Bala Mohan Reddy, learned counsel for respondent Nos.8 to 10. Despite service of notice, none appeared for respondent Nos.1 to 7.

2. This Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India challenging the order dated 17.12.2025 in I.A.No.1896 of 2025 in A.O.P.No.184 of 2022 passed by the learned XI Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad.

2. Respondent Nos.1 to 4 herein have filed a petition under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (for short 'the Act of 1996') vide Arb.O.P.No.184 of 2021 against the petitioners herein and respondent Nos.5 to 7.

3. Vide order dated 11.01.2024, learned trial Court allowed the said application restraining the respondent Nos.1 to 5 therein by way of ad-interim injunction from alienating the property covered under MOU dated 08.09.2021 and also the property covered under Development Agreement-cum-General Power of Attorney dated 03.12.2021 vide document No.2256/2022 i.e., 'A' schedule property and the respondents therein were further restrained from interfering with the possession of the petitioners over the 'B' schedule property.

4. Challenging the said order, petitioners herein have preferred an appeal vide Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No.318 of 2024 under Section 39 of the Act of 1996. Vide order dated 21.03.2025, this Court allowed the said appeal in part vacating the interim stay insofar as restraint from alienating the suit schedule property, on the condition of the appellants providing solvent security to the

satisfaction of the learned XI Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad for an amount of Rs.6,00,00,000/- and permitting the appellants therein to carry out the development activities.

5. In compliance with the said order, petitioners herein have furnished Solvency Security Certificate dated 15.11.2025 issued by State Bank of India, Specialized Startup Hub Branch, Hyderabad along with an interlocutory application vide I.A.No.1896 of 2025. Learned trial Court accepted the said Solvency Security Certificate vide order dated 24.11.2025.

6. Respondent Nos.8 to 10 have filed an interlocutory application vide I.A.No.1908 of 2025 in I.A.No.1896 of 2025 in Arb.O.P.No.184 of 2022 to recall the order dated 24.11.2025 on the ground that respondent Nos.8 to 10 were not put on notice. Vide order dated 26.11.2025, learned trial Court allowed the said application and recalled the order dated 24.11.2025. Thereafter, learned trial Court passed impugned order dated 17.12.2025 holding that the solvency security certificate produced by the petitioners cannot be accepted. Hence, petitioners were directed to

furnish proper and adequate solvency security, as per the directions of this Court. Challenging the said order, petitioners filed the present revision.

7. It is the specific contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners herein that the petitioners have furnished Solvency Security Certificate to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court for an amount of Rs.6,00,00,000/- in compliance with the order dated 21.03.2025 in C.M.A.No.318 of 2024. Vide order dated 24.11.2025, learned trial Court accepted the said solvency security. Having accepted the Solvency Security furnished by the petitioners, learned trial Court cannot recall its order dated 24.11.2025. Therefore, the orders dated 26.11.2025 and 17.12.2025 are illegal and contrary to the order dated 21.03.2025 in C.M.A.No.318 of 2024 passed by this Court.

8. Whereas, Sri T.Bala Mohan Reddy, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.8 to 10 would contend that the Solvency Security Certificate dated 15.11.2025 submitted by the petitioners, is not in accordance with the order of the Division Bench of this Court in C.M.A.No.318 of 2024. The FDR obtained

by petitioners is in the name of 1st petitioner and there is every possibility of 1st petitioner withdrawing the same, in which event, the interest of respondent Nos.8 to 10 would be defeated. Moreover, it was obtained for only one year. On consideration of the same only, learned trial Court recalled its order dated 24.11.2025 and passed impugned order dated 17.12.2025. There is no error in it.

9. In the light of the aforesaid submission, in the Solvency Security Certificate dated 15.11.2025 issued by the State Bank of India, it is specifically stated as follows:

"Ms/IRA Square Township LLP deposited an amount of Rs.6 Crores on 11.11.2025, towards solvency security towards all claims, costs, damages and expenses which may be incurred by the Bank, arising out of, or in connection with the Bank.

M/s.IRA SQUARE TOWNSHIP LLP agree to indemnify the Bank against all claims, costs, damages and expenses which may be incurred by the Bank, arising out of, or in connection with the Bank having issued this Solvency Security Certificate."

10. Perusal of the record would reveal that the petitioners herein have obtained Fixed Deposit Receipt A/c. No.44707173236, dated 04.12.2025 for an amount of Rs.6 Crores, value date from 18.11.2025 and maturity date 18.11.2026. It is in the name of 1st

petitioner i.e., M/s.IRA SQUARE TOWNSHIP LLP According to respondent Nos.8 to 10, the said certificate is in the name of 1st petitioner, it is not in the name of the Court, therefore, it is not in compliance with the order dated 21.03.2025 in C.M.A.No.318 of 2024 passed by this Court.

11. Learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos 8 to 10 would submit that the petitioners have to furnish Bank Guarantee by way of immovable property worth of Rs.6 Crores or they have to obtain FDR in the name of learned trial Court i.e., XI Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad, so as to protect the interest of respondent Nos.8 to 10 during pendency of arbitral proceedings.

12. During the course of hearing, it is brought to the notice of this Court that Justice A.Rajasheker Reddy, former Judge of this Court, has been appointed as an Arbitrator and he has already commenced proceedings. The said arbitral proceedings are posted to 28.01.2026. Referring to the same, learned counsel for the petitioners would contend that as per Section 29 of the Act of 1996, learned Arbitrator has to conclude arbitration proceedings within six months and petitioners are ready to furnish the said FDR in the

name of trial Court for a period of 18 months to protect the interest of respondent Nos.8 to 10.

13. In the light of the said submission, this Revision is disposed of directing the petitioners herein to obtain fresh FDR in the name of XI Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad for an amount of Rs.6 Crores for a period of 18 months to the credit of Arb.O.P.No.184 of 2022, file the original FDR before the learned trial Court within one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The petitioners shall submit an undertaking before the learned trial Court that it will take necessary steps to extend the said FDR till conclusion of arbitration proceedings. On furnishing of the said FDR, learned XI Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad, shall accept the said FDR. It is also made clear that on conclusion of the said arbitral proceedings, the petitioners and respondents 8 to 10 shall take steps, in accordance with law.

**SD/- M. OSMAN ALI BAIG
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The XI Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court at Hyderabad((with records If any)
2. One CC to Ms. MADHAVI PRIYA MANTENA, Advocate [OPUC]
3. One CC to T. Bala Mohan Reddy, Advocate [OPUC]
4. Two CD Copies

STB/psl



HIGH COURT

DATED: 22/01/2026

ORDER

CRP.No.1 of 2026



DISPOSING THE CRP

⑥
lps
23/2/26