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

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY NINTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B.VIJAYSEN REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 14211 OF 2026

Between:

Shiva Sai Constructions, a Partnership firm represented by its Managing Partner Mula Venkatramana S/o Prabhakar Reddy aged 39 years Occ Business R/o.4-69/26/B/18, Teegulagutapali village Karimnagar Rural Mandal, Karimnagar District

...PETITIONER

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary (Revenue) Government of Telangana Secretariat Buildings Hyderabad.
2. The Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, Nampally, Hyderabad
3. The Commissioner and Inspector General of Registration and Stamps, Hyderabad.
4. The District Collector, Karimnagar District at Karimnagar
5. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Karimnagar Division at Karimnagar
6. The District Registrar, Registration and Stamps Department Karimnagar District at Karimnagar
7. The Tahsildar, Kothapalli Mandal, Karimnagar District
8. The Sub-Registrar, Registration and Stamps Department Gangadhara, Karimnagar District

...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 topleased to issue an appropriate writ order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the 4th respondent, District Collector in notifying land bearing Sy.No.205 shown at Sl.No.6 of Appendix -XI (Rule

238 to 241), in Form V under Section 22-A (1) (d) of the Registration Act, 1908, vide Letter.No.E1/1048/2025 dt.24.10.2025, situated at Kothapally (Haveli) village, Kothapally Mandal, Karimnagar District, as illegal, arbitrary, without jurisdiction and in violation of the principles of natural justice, being contrary to the provisions of Registration Act and rules framed thereunder, and in utter violation of Articles 14 and 300-A of the Constitution of India, Consequently to quash the same by directing the respondent authorities to delete/ remove the impugned letter along with the Appendix from all the official websites/ Portals of the respondents.

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 authorities to consider my representation dt. 16.03.2026 for excluding / de-notifying land in Sy.No.205, situated at Kothapally (Haveli) village, Kothapally Mandal, Karimnagar District from the Prohibitory list notified U/s Section 22-A (1) (d) of Registration Act in Lr.No.E1/104f8/2025 dt.24.10.2025 by affording an opportunity of hearing, as otherwise petitioner stands to suffer serious hardship irreparable loss.

Counsel for the Petitioner : Sri N.Manohar

Counsel for the Respondents: ASST.GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following: ORDER

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B. VIJAYSEN REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.14211 OF 2026

DATE OF ORDER: 29.04.2026

Between:

Shiva Sai Constructions

...Petitioner

AND

The State of Telangana
Represented by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...Respondents

ORDER : (ORAL)

Heard Mr. N.Manohar, learned counsel for the petitioner; Mr. L.Ravinder, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, appearing for the respondents; and perused the material on record.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in similar circumstances, the order dated 29.04.2026 was passed by this Court in W.P. No.14198 of 2026 and requested this Court that similar order may be passed in this writ petition. The said submission is not opposed by the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue.

3. Recording the aforesaid submission, without entering into the merits of the case, the writ petition is disposed of directing respondent No.4 to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 16.03.2026 for removal/deletion of the

land in Survey No.205, situated at Rekurthy Village, Kothapally Mandal, Karimnagar District from the prohibitory list of properties shown at Sl. No.6 of Appendix-XI (Rule 238 to 241) in Form-V, under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908 *vide* letter No.E1/1048/2025 dated 24.10.2025, by issuing notice to the petitioner and to all other concerned/interested persons, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, within a period of sixty (60) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous applications, if any, pending in the writ petition, stand closed.

Sd/-C.DEEPIKA
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Secretary (Revenue) Government of Telangana Secretariat Buildings Hyderabad.
2. The Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, Nampally, Hyderabad
3. The Commissioner and Inspector General of Registration and Stamps, Hyderabad.
4. The District Collector, Karimnagar District at Karimnagar
5. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Karimnagar Division at Karimnagar
6. The District Registrar, Registration and Stamps Department Karimnagar District at Karimnagar
7. The Tahsildar, Kothapalli Mandal, Karimnagar District
8. The Sub-Registrar, Registration and Stamps Department Gangadhara, Karimnagar District
9. One CC to SRI N.MANOHAR, Advocate. [OPUC]
10. Two CCs to GP FOR REVENUE, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT]
11. Two CD Copies.

BSK/PMK

HIGH COURT

DATED: 29/04/2026

CC TODAY



ORDER

WP.No.14211 of 2026

DISPOSING OF THE WRIT PETITION WITHOUT COSTS

14
04/5/26

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B. VIJAYSEN REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.14198 OF 2026

DATE OF ORDER: 29.04.2026

Between:

Parem Usha Rani

...Petitioner

AND

The State of Telangana
Represented by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...Respondents

ORDER : (ORAL)

This writ petition is filed by the petitioner seeking to declare the action of respondent No.4 in including the land in Survey No.52, situated at Rekurthy Village, Kothapally Mandal, Karimnagar District in the prohibitory list of properties at Sl. No.37 of Appendix-XI (Rule 238 to 241) in Form-V, under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908 *vide* letter No.E1/1048/2025 dated 24.10.2025, without following due process of law, as being illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional.

2. Heard Mr. N.Manohar, learned counsel for the petitioner; Mr. L.Ravinder, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, appearing for the respondents; and perused the material on record.

3. It is submitted that the petitioner along with one Mr. G.Ananth Reddy purchased Plot No.9, admeasuring 277.7 square yards in Survey No.52, situated at Rekurthy Village, Kothapally Mandal, Karimnagar District under registered sale deed bearing document No.8632 of 2010 dated 12.10.2010 from one Ms. G.Mallamma. Thereafter the said G. Ananth Reddy released his half share to the petitioner under registered sale deed bearing document No.8643 of 2012 dated 30.07.2012.

4. It is submitted that originally, the land admeasuring Acs.48-20 cents in Survey Nos.2, 52, 58, 59, 100, 101, 138, 220 and 222, situated at Rekurthy Village, Kothapally Mandal, Karimnagar District, was owned by one Ms. Ameena Bee D/o. Shaik Saleh; she filed declaration in C.C. No.1665/KNR/75 wherein the order dated 02.11.1976 was passed by the Land Reforms Tribunal, Karimnagar (LRT) holding that "*the declarant is entitled to hold one standard holding, since the total standard holding held by family unit is less than the ceiling area U/s 4(1) of the Act and determined U/s 9 of the Act, that the family unit did not hold in excess of the ceiling limit on the notified date i.e., 01.01.1975. Katha is in the name of the declarant. Further, it was held that, "the alienation of these lands is prohibited U/s 17 (1) of the Act".*" Ms. Ameena Bee executed registered sale deed in favour of Ms. Gandham Mallamma (the vendor of the petitioner) *vide* document No.197 of 1995 dated 07.01.1995 in respect of the subject land admeasuring 277.7 square

yards in Survey No.52, situated at Rekurthy village, Kothapally Mandal, Karimnagar District. Ms. Ameen Bee preferred an appeal before the LRT in Appeal No.456 of 77/K and the same was allowed by order dated 28.02.1977 holding that "*the lower Tribunal went wrong in invoking section 17(1) of the act and prohibiting the appellant from alienating the lands*" and order has attained finality.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that respondent No.4, without following due procedure and without verifying the records, notified the subject land in the prohibitory list of properties *vide* letter No.E1/1048/2025 dated 24.10.2025 at Sl. No.37 of Appendix-XI, (Rule 238-241) in Form-V, shown as the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 relating to the family of Mr. Shaik Saleh (late) in C.C. No.200 of 1997. It is submitted that respondent No.4 has wrongly notified the subject land in prohibitory list of properties in Form-V instead of Form-III and has also not signed the said form. The very procedure adopted by respondent No.4 in notifying the subject land in the prohibitory list of properties is bad in law and contrary to Rule 240 of the Telangana Rules under the Registration Act, 1908.

6. It is submitted that one Mr. Laxman made application dated 22.01.2026 under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (for short 'RTI') to respondents No.4 and 5 requesting to furnish the entire record pertaining to C.C. No.200 of 1997

who in-turn furnished the same *vide* letter dated 23.02.2026 enclosing letter dated 16.02.2026 and 12.02.2026 stating that "*the said file not pertains or available with this Section*" and also stated that "*upon searching in the office the file could not be traced*". That similar applications were made by Mr. Laxman under RTI to respondents No.5 to 7 who in-turn furnished reply dated 28.01.2026, 31.01.2026 and 05.02.2026 informing that the said file is not available in the offices.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the subject land was not identified as ceiling surplus land and it is purely a patta land. The petitioner submitted representation dated 20.02.2026 for removing/deleting the subject land from the prohibitory list of properties, however, the same has not been considered so far. The grievance of the petitioner is that respondent No.4, without conducting proper enquiry and without issuing any prior notice to the petitioner, wrongly included the subject land in the prohibitory list of properties, as such, she is constrained to approach this Court.

8. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue submitted that appropriate action will be taken on the representation of the petitioner in accordance with law.

9. Recording the aforesaid submission, without entering into the merits of the case, the writ petition is disposed of directing respondent No.4 to consider

the representation of the petitioner dated 20.02.2026 for removal/deletion of the land in Survey No.52, situated at Rekurthy Village, Kothapally Mandal, Karimnagar District from the prohibitory list of properties at Sl. No.37 of Appendix-XI (Rule 238 to 241) in Form-V, under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908 *vide* letter No.E1/1048/2025 dated 24.10.2025, by issuing notice to the petitioner and to all other concerned/interested persons, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, within a period of sixty (60) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous applications, if any, pending in the writ petition, stand closed.

B. VIJAYSEN REDDY, J

April 29, 2026
RRK