

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE J. SREENIVAS RAO**

**+ WRIT PETITION Nos.22876 and 22921 of 2024**

% Dated 04.03.2025

**W.P.No.22876 of 2024**

# Sadiq Ali Topiwala S/o.late Shabbir Hussain,  
Aged: 48 years, Occ: Business,  
R/o.Plot No.81, RTC Colony, Trimulgherry,  
Secunderabad – 500 015 and another

....Petitioners

VERSUS

\$ State of Telangana, rep. by its Principal Secretary,  
Department of Municipal Administration &  
Urban Development, Secretariat, Saifabad,  
Hyderabad and four others

... Respondents

**W.P.No.22921 of 2024**

# G.S.K. Pavan Kumar S/o.Sri G.Gopi Ram,  
Aged: about 50 years, Occ: Business,  
R/o.Flat No.202, Plot No.29, Sai Sree Nivasa Towers,  
Sripuri Colony, Kakaguda, Secunderabad

....Petitioner

VERSUS

\$ State of Telangana, rep. by its Principal Secretary,  
Department of Municipal Administration &  
Urban Development, Secretariat, Saifabad,  
Hyderabad and three others

... Respondents

! Counsel for Petitioners : Mr.M. Srikanth (W.P.No.22876 of 2024)  
Mr. A. Muneedhar Reddy (W.P.No.22921 OF 2024)

^ Counsel for Respondents :Mr. K.R.Koteswar Rao, for R.2

& R.3 and R.4 (W.P.No.22921 of 2024)

< GIST:

> HEAD NOTE:

? CITATIONS:

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE J.SREENIVAS RAO****WRIT PETITION Nos. 22876 and 22921 OF 2024****COMMON ORDER:**

In W.P.No.22876 of 2024, the petitioners have questioned the action of respondent No.2 in rejecting the building permission application in respect of open plot admeasuring 400 square yards in Block No.I covered by Sy.No.62 (old), Sy.No.66/1 (new) situated at Trimulgherry Village, Secunderabad Cantonment, *vide* online status dated 24.07.2024.

2. In W.P.No.22921 of 2024, the petitioner had questioned the action of respondent No.2 in rejecting his building permission application in respect of open plot admeasuring 200 square yards in Plot No.1/part forming part of Sy.No.66/1, in the layout of Vanita Co-operative Housing Society Limited situated at Trimulgherry Village, Secunderabad Cantonment, *vide* online status dated 01.07.2024 and insisting him to obtain NOC from State Government authorities.

3. A common issue arises for consideration in these two writ petitions. Therefore, these two writ petitions were heard together and are being decided by this common order.

4. Heard Mr. M.Surender Rao, learned Senior Counsel, representing Mr. M.Srikanth and Mr. A.Muneedhar Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners in both the writ petitions and Mr. K.R.Koteswara Rao, learned Standing Counsel for respondent No.2, learned Assistant Government Pleader appearing for Revenue for respondent Nos.3 to 5 in W.P.No.22876 of 2024 and respondent Nos.3 and 4 in W.P.No.22921 of 2024. No representation on behalf of respondent No.1 in both the writ petitions.

**Brief facts of the case**

5. **In W.P.No.22876 of 2024:**

5.1 Facts giving rise to filing of this writ petition briefly stated are that the petitioners are claiming that they are joint owners and possessors of open plot situated in admeasuring 400 square yards in Block No. I covered by Sy.No.62 (old), Sy.No.66/1 (new) situated at Trimulgherry Village, Secunderabad Cantonment and the same was purchased through registered sale deed bearing document No.2134 of 2023 dated 06.12.2023 from their vendors K.Krishna and K.Padmavati by paying valuable sale consideration and since then they have been in possession and enjoyment of the said property.

5.2 It is further averred that one Kalika Prasad was the owner of the agriculture land admeasuring Ac.6-08 guntas in Sy.No.62(old),

new Sy.No.66/1 situated at Trimulgherry Village, Secunderabad Cantonment and he purchased the same from the Government in a public auction in 1352 Fasli (1943) and since then he was in possession and enjoyment of the same and his name was entered in the settlement records and that he died on 28.07.1959 leaving behind his five daughters and one son by name Munnalal. After his death, his son Munnalal filed Revision Petition in File No.P5/3434/81 before the Commissioner, Survey, Settlement and Land Records, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad requesting to declare the above said land as patta land. The said Revision Petition was disposed on 21.11.1983 declaring that Kalika Prasad is the owner of the above said land and the same was purchased from the Government in the public auction and therefore, the said land is not a Government land. Thereafter the legal representatives of Kalika Prasad have filed suit in O.S.No.1886 of 1989 on the file of the I Additional Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad, seeking partition and allotment of their respective shares. In the said suit, a final decree was passed on 05.02.1990 and allotted 1/6<sup>th</sup> share i.e., Ac.0-34.66 guntas out of Ac.6-08 guntas, to Gangia Bai who is the daughter of Kalika Prasad. The said Gangia Bai through her General Power of Attorney holder N.Vishwanatham, sold the open plot admeasuring 400 square yards bearing Sy.No.62(old), 66/1(new) in favour of Master Chilumala Sunil Anand through

registered sale deed document bearing No.2397 of 1990 dated 15.09.1990 and it was rectified on 31.10.1991. The said Chilumala Sunil Anand sold the above said open plot to S.Anand Babu and P.Sudhakar Reddy through registered sale deed bearing document No.1331 of 2006 dated 23.06.2006. In turn they have sold the above said land in favour of K.Krishna and K.Padmavathi through registered sale deed dated 04.02.2008. Thereafter the petitioners have purchased the above said land from them through registered sale deed dated 06.12.2023.

5.3 It is further averred that the petitioners' vendors have applied building permission for construction of Ground plus two floors before respondent no.2. Respondent No.2 sought clarification from respondent No.5 regarding the nature of the said open plot. Accordingly respondent No.5 had issued letter dated 21.11.2013 basing upon the report submitted by the Deputy Inspector of Survey stating that the above said plot falls under Sy.No.62(old), 66/1 (new) situated at Trimulgeery Village, Secunderabad and as per the revenue records, the said land was recorded as patta land. Pursuant to the said clarification, respondent No.2 through letter dated 22.03.2014 informing the petitioners vendors that the building application has been approved through resolution No.37(01) dated 26.02.2014 and

calling upon them to pay Rs.2,50,900/- towards development charges and Rs.5,000/- towards conservancy fee within 15 days from the date of receipt of the letter and also comply with the requirements of rain water harvest pit in the said open plot.

5.4 It is also averred that their vendors have approached respondent No.2 through letter dated 12.06.2015 stating that they could not pay the above said development charges and conservancy charges in time due to financial and health problems and now they want to pay the said amount and requested to release the building plan. Accordingly, respondent No.2 considered the request made by the vendors of the petitioners and the vendors of the petitioners have paid the development/betterment charges of Rs.2,50,900/- and conservancy fee of Rs.5,000/- on 15.06.2015. On such payment, respondent No.2 had released the preliminary sanctioned building plan in favour of the vendors of the petitioners on 20.06.2015 through letter dated 24.06.2015. Subsequently, the vendors of the petitioners could not proceed with the construction of building due to financial problems and sold the same to the petitioners. Thereafter, the petitioners have jointly submitted application before respondent No.2 for mutation of their names in respect of the said open plot. After due verification of the records, respondent No.2 mutated the names of the petitioners in the

records and issued proceedings dated 06.03.2024 and the petitioners paying vacant property tax. In the meanwhile, the petitioners applied to the Airports Authority of India for grant of No Objection Certificate (for short 'NOC') for height clearance for the proposed building construction in the said open plot. Accordingly, the Airports Authority of India has granted NOC dated 08.01.2024 for height clearance. Thereafter the petitioner submitted application through online on 06.04.2024 before respondent No.2 for grant of building permission and plan for construction of the building with Stilt + ground+ first+ second floors by paying requisite fee.

5.5 It is further averred that when they checked the status of their building permission application in the official web site of respondent No.2, they came to know that their application was rejected on 24.07.2024, basing on the objection raised by the revenue authorities vide letter No. B/359/2024 dated 19.07.2024. Questioning the said rejection order, the petitioners have filed the present writ petition.

**6. In W.P.No.22921 of 2024:**

6.1 The petitioner claimed that he is owner of the open plot No.1/part, forming part of Sy.No.66/1 admeasuring 200 square yards in the layout of Co-operative Housing Society Limited

Trimulgherry Village, Secunderabad Cantonment having purchased the same vide registered document bearing No.1016 of 2022, dated 02.06.2022. It is further averred that originally one Kalika Prasad was the owner of the agriculture land to an extent of Ac.6-08 guntas in Sy.No.62(old), new Sy.No.66/1 situated at Trimulgherry Village, Secunderabad Cantonment and he purchased the same from the Government in a public auction in 1352 Fasli (1943) and he died on 28.07.1959. After his death, his successors have filed suit in O.S.No.1886 of 1989 on the file of the I Additional Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad seeking partition of the above said property, wherein final decree was passed on 05.02.1990. Pursuant to the same, the legal representatives of Kalika Prasad sold part of the said land to Vanita Co-operative Housing Society Limited situated at Trimulgherry Village under different registered sale deeds. The said Society formed a layout in the said land and sold the plot in favour of P. Jhansi through registered sale deed bearing document No.1323 of 1991 dated 18.06.1991 and the said Jhansi executed the registered gift settlement deed bearing document No.1703 of 2008 dated 27.11.2008 in favour of her daughter namely P.Rani. Thereafter P. Rani sold the above said property to Maddela Praveen Kumar through registered sale deed bearing document No.813 of 2019 in Book-I dated 20.04.2019 through her GPA holder. The said



Maddela Praveen Kumar @ Maddela Praveen Kumar Goud died intestate on 08.05.2021 leaving behind his wife, daughter and son. The above said persons through their registered Agreement of Sale Cum General Power of Attorney (AGPA) holder namely Kankati Parandamulu sold the above said property to the petitioner through registered sale deed bearing document No.1016 of 2022 dated 02.06.2022 and since then he has been in possession and enjoyment of the said property.

6.2 It is also averred that the petitioner submitted application through online on 03.04.2024 for grant of building permission before respondent No.2 for construction of residential building consisting Stilt+ ground + first + second floors on 03.04.2024 by paying requisite fee and also submitted all the relevant documents. When the petitioner checked the status of the building permission application in the first week of August, 2024, he came to know that the building permission application is rejected on 01.07.2024 and in the comment's column, it is stated that "As the State Government interested is involved in the land matter. Hence, requested to obtain NOC from the State Government authorities and resubmit the building plan". Questioning the same, the petitioner filed the present writ petition.

## **7. Submissions of the learned Counsel for the petitioners:**

7.1 Learned Senior Counsel submitted that the petitioners have purchased the property through registered sale deeds from rightful owners by paying valuable sale consideration. Hence, respondent No.2 is not entitled to reject the application submitted by the petitioners for construction of building in the respective properties on the alleged ground that the revenue authorities raised objection and also directing the petitioner in W.P.No.22921 of 2024 to obtain NOC from the State Government and the same is contrary to law.

7.2 He further submitted that respondent No.2 has granted building permission in favour of the petitioner's vendor in W.P.No.22876 of 2024 on 24.06.2015 after following due procedure on 24.06.2015 but due to the financial problems, they could not construct the house and they alienated the said property in favour of the petitioners. Subsequently respondent No.2 issued mutation proceedings in favour of the petitioners and the petitioners have paid the property tax from 01.04.2023. Hence, respondent No.2 is not entitled to reject the application for construction of building on the alleged ground that the revenue authorities raised objection and the same is contrary to their own proceedings dated 24.06.2015 and also orders of the Commissioner of Survey, Settlement and Land records dated 21.11.1983.

7.3 He further submitted that the subject land falls within the civil area and respondent No.2 has already collected property tax and issued proceedings on 02.01.2024. Hence, respondent No.2 is not entitled to contend that the subject property is outside the civil area. He also submitted that respondent No.2 without giving notice and opportunity to the petitioners and without giving any reasons rejected the building plan applications submitted by the petitioners and the same is gross violation of the principles of natural justice and also contrary to law. Respondent No.2 is not having any authority or power to insist the petitioners to obtain NOC from the concerned State Government authorities and also not entitled to reject the application on the ground of objection raised by the revenue authorities.

7.4 In support of his contention, he relied upon the orders passed by the erstwhile High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad in

1. **Tahir N.Khambati and others v. Secunderabad Cantonment Board (W.P.No.11091 of 2006)**
2. **Smt. Chandrakala Despande and Another v. The Union of India and 3 Others (W.P.No.18251 of 2020)**
3. **Kusuma Jaipal v. State of Telangana (W.P.No.23691 of 2023)**

4. **T. Kishan Rao v. Secunderabad Cantonment Board (W.P.No.17259 of 2024)**

8. **Submissions of the learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2:**

8.1 Learned Standing Counsel submitted that the petitioners have the purchased subject property from unapproved layout. Hence, for ascertain the identification of the subject plot and boundaries, respondent No.2 addressed a letter dated 02.05.2024 to the respondent No.3 requesting the concerned to demarcate the subject plot and forward the survey report and not instated the petitioners to produce NOC from the revenue authorities. Pursuant to the said letter only, respondent No.5 had issued letter dated 19.07.2024 requesting respondent No.2 to cancel the permission for construction of building in an open plot at Sy.No.62(old), Sy.No.66/1)(new). Accordingly, respondent No.2 rejected the building permission in favour of the petitioners. He further submitted that respondent No.2 by exercising the powers conferred under the provisions of Cantonment Act,2006 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") rightly issued the impugned proceedings and the same is valid under law and the orders, which were relied upon by the petitioners in **W.P.No.11091 of 2006 dated 19.06.2006, W.P.No.23691 of 2023 dated 31.08.2023 and W.P.No.17259 of**

**2024 dated 15.10.2024**, are not applicable to the facts and circumstances of the case, especially the subject property comes outside the purview of the civil area.

8.2 He further submitted that the revenue authorities as well as Wakf Board are claiming rights in respect of the subject property. Hence, respondent no.2 has rightly rejected the building permission in favour of the petitioners and they are not entitled the relief by basing upon the orders passed in the above said writ petitions and the facts and circumstances of the case are totally different.

9. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue appearing on behalf of respondent no.3 to 5 submitted that he is adopting the submissions made by the learned Standing Counsel, for respondent no.2.

10. Learned Senior Counsel by way of reply submitted that the petitioners and their vendors have purchased the property from rightful owners through registered sale deeds and in the year 1990-1991, the subject property transferred from one person to another and thereafter, four transactions were taken place and registered sale deeds containing the boundaries of the property and respondent No.2 is not entitled to seek any clarification from the revenue authorities through letter dated 02.05.2024 on the ground

to ascertain of the boundaries of the property. Especially, respondent No.2 has not filed the said document, before this court.

11. He further submitted that the stand taken by respondent No.2 that they are not rejected the building application of the petitioners, on the ground of non-production of NOC is not tenable under law, especially respondent No.2 rejected the application of the petitioner in W.P.No.22921 of 2024 to obtain NOC from the State Government authorities. Hence the stand taken by respondent No.2 Cantonment Board is not permissible under law.

**Analysis:**

12. Having considered the rival submissions made by the respective parties and after perusal of the material available on record, it reveals that originally one Kalika Prasad claiming that he is owner and possessor of the agriculture land to an extent of Ac.6-08 guntas in Sy.No.62(old), Sy.No.66/1 (new) situated at Trimulgherry Village, Secunderabad Cantonment and he purchased the same from the Government in public auction in 1352 Fasli (1943) and he died on 28.07.1959. Thereafter his son namely Munnalal filed Revision Petition in File No.P5/3434/81 before the Commissioner of Survey, Settlement and Land Records, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, requesting to declare the above said land as patta land and to cancel the orders passed by the Revenue

Divisional Officer during the pendency of the said revision petition. In the said revision petition, revenue authorities namely Collector, Hyderabad, R.D.O., Hyderabad, A.P. Wakf Board and other two private individuals were arrayed as party respondents. The Commissioner of Survey and Settlement after due verification of the records and after hearing the contesting parties disposed of the revision petition by its RDO order dated 21.11.1983. The operative portion of the order reads as follows:

“I have carefully considered the material before me and the arguments of the various contesting parties. It is clear from the record before me that the land in question was once an Inam land which was resumed by Government (Sherike Khalsa). The moment the land was resumed by Government, which was as far back as in 1339 Fasli, the land became Government land and no evidence has been produced before me to show that these orders were challenged or reversed. When the land became Government land, the Inam rights do not subsist and Government were at liberty to auction it as had been done in this case. The revision petitioner was the auction purchaser and the sale was also confirmed by the Collector as required under the provisions of Land Revenue Act and these orders also were neither assailed nor set aside under Section 137 of the L.R. Act auction sale becomes absolute in favour of the purchaser as again all other persons.

As observed earlier the orders passed by the Collector in 1952 ordering correction of settlement records were in violation of mandatory provisions of Section 87 of the Land Revenue Act, and hence they are void. Granting a certificate under the Inam Abolition Act also is void since the land ceased to be Inam Land. The orders of the Collector confirming the auction had become final. Confusion has arisen in this case as different parties obtained different orders from different forums. None of the forums cared to ascertain the full back ground of the case, and hence contradictory orders have been passed.

Taking an overall view of the situation, the orders of the Collector confirming the auction which are the earliest ones are valid and should be acted upon. With these observations the revision petition is disposed off.”

13. In the above said order, it is held that the revision petitioner was the auction purchaser and the sale was also confirmed by the Collector as required under the provisions of the Land Revenue Act and the order of the Collector confirming auction are earliest ones are valid.

14. The record further reveals that the successors of Kalika Prasad filed suit in O.S.No.1886 of 1989 on the file of the I Additional Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad seeking partition and allotment of their respective shares, wherein a final decree was



passed on 05.02.1990. Pursuant to the same, Gangia Bai, who was the daughter of late Kalika Prasad through her GPA holder alienated 400 square yards through registered sale deeds dated 31.10.1991 in favour of Master Chilumala Sunil Anand by receiving valid sale consideration. Thereafter two transactions were taken place through registered sale deeds on 23.06.2006 and 04.02.2008. The petitioners in W.P. No. 22876 of 2024 have purchased the property through registered sale deed dated 06.12.2023 from K.Krishna and K.Padmavathi.

15. The record further reveals that the petitioners' vendors have submitted application for sanction of building construction permission before respondent No.2. Respondent No.2 has directed the vendor of the petitioners to pay an amount of Rs.2,50,900/- towards development charges and Rs.5,000/- towards conservancy fee. Accordingly, they paid the same and respondent No.2 issued preliminary sanction of building plan in favour of the vendor of the petitioners vide preliminary sanction dated 24.06.2015. However, they could not proceed with the construction and they alienated the property in favour of the petitioners through registered sale deed dated 06.12.2023. Subsequently the petitioners have submitted application for grant of building permission and

respondent No.2 rejected the same on 24.07.2024 basing upon the letter issued by respondent No.5.

16. It is relevant to mention here that respondent No.2 had granted building permission in favour of vendors of the petitioners dated 24.06.2015. Similarly, pursuant to the registered sale deed dated 06.12.2023, respondent No.2 had made assessment in respect of open plot of the petitioners and issued proceedings dated 02.01.2024 under section 76 of the Act and directed the petitioners to pay an amount of Rs. 43,200/- per annum towards Annual rental value system (ARV) and they paid the said amounts.

17. The record further reveals that the successors of Kalika Prasad alienated the property covered by Sy.No.62 (old) and Sy.No.66/1(new) in favour of Vanita Co-operative Housing Society Limited situated at Trimulgherry Village, Secunderabad Cantonment and also other individuals by executing registered sale deeds.

18. In **Tahir N.Khambati and others v. Secunderabad Cantonment Board** (W.P. No.11091 of 2006), the erstwhile High Court of Andhra Pradesh while allowing the writ petition directed the respondent Cantonment to consider the application of the petitioners therein for sanction of a layout without insisting the petitioners obtain a NOC from the revenue authorities. Aggrieved

by the same, the respondent Cantonment Board filed Writ Appeal No.793 of 2007 and the same was dismissed by the Division Bench of the erstwhile High Court of Andhra Pradesh on 05.08.2008. Aggrieved by the same, respondent filed S.L.P.(Civil) No.4476 of 2009 and the Hon'ble Apex Court dismissed the same on 02.03.2009. It is relevant to extract the orders of the Hon'ble Apex Court as follows:

“We find no ground to interfere as the High Court has only held that for the purpose of considering the application filed by a private applicant for approval of lay out, the Board need not insist upon a no objection certificate from Mandal Revenue Officer. This order does not come in way of the Board requiring the applicant to produce copies of title deeds or the Revenue extract under the Andhra Pradesh Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act to satisfy itself that the applicant is the owner. Nor does it come in the way of the Board issuing approval if otherwise found to be eligible, with an endorsement that the approval shall not be treated as approval or acceptance of title.

In view of the above, the special leave petition is dismissed.”

19. In **Smt. Chandrakala Despande and Another v. The Union of India and 3 Others** (W.P.No.18251 of 2020 and 8282 of 2021), this Court while setting aside the rejection order passed by the

Cantonment Board, remitted the matter to the authority to decide application afresh on its own merits and not to insist for NOC.

20. It is relevant to mention here that in similar circumstances when respondent No.2 rejected the building permission in respect of the property covered in the very same Sy. No. 66/1 and who had purchased the same from Vanita Co-operative Housing Society Limited, approached this Court and filed W.P.No.23691 of 2023 **(Kusuma Jaipal v. State of Telangana)** and the same was allowed on 31.08.2023 and directed the Cantonment board to release building construction permission in favour of the petitioner therein within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the order.

21. In **T. Kishan Rao v. Secunderabad Cantonment Board** (W.P.No.17259 of 2024), the petitioner therein questioned the action of respondent-Cantonment Board in seeking any objections, reports, NOC from the District Collector, Hyderabad District for grant of layout permission and also questioned the letter issued by the respondent Cantonment Board dated 26.06.2024 directing the petitioner to produce any objections, reports, NOC etc., from the District Collector, Hyderabad District for grant of layout permission. This Court allowed the said writ petition taking into

consideration the orders of 2 Co-ordinate Benches dated 19.06.2006 and 11.03.2024.

22. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners during the course of hearing submitted that pursuant to the orders dated 31.08.2023 passed in W.P.No.23691 of 2023, respondent No.2 has granted building permission in favour of the petitioner therein. Hence, respondent No.2 is not entitled to reject the building application of the petitioner in W.P.No.22921 of 2024, on the ground of non-submission of NOC especially, the petitioner purchased 200 square yards in Plot No.1/part forming part of Sy.No.66/1, from very same Vanita Co-operative Housing Society Limited and the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.23691 of 2023 dated 31.08.2023 is binding upon respondent No.2.

23. Insofar as the contentions of the learned standing counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2 that respondent No.2 had not insisted the petitioners to produce the NOC from the State Government authorities and only addressed a letter to respondent No.3 on 02.05.2024 seeking clarification on the ground that the subject property is not having proper boundaries are concerned, respondent No.2 has not filed the copy of the said letter before this Court, especially respondent No.2 had rejected the building permission in favour of the petitioner in W.P.No.22921 of 2024 on

the ground that the petitioner has to obtain NOC from the concerned State Government authorities. Hence, the contention raised by the learned counsel for respondent No.2 that respondent No.2 is not insisting the petitioners to produce NOC from the State Government authorities/revenue authorities and only they sought clarification through letter dated 02.05.2024 is not tenable under law.

24. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and also pursuant to the orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.23691 of 2023, dated 31.08.2023, and W.P. No. 17259 of 2024, dated 15.10.2024, this Court is of the considered view that respondent No.2 is not entitled to reject the building permission application submitted by the petitioner in W.P.No.22921 of 2024 on the ground of non-production of NOC from the State Government authorities is violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

25. Similarly the impugned rejection order passed by respondent No.2 in W.P.No.22876 of 2024 on the ground of objection raised by the revenue authorities through letter dated 19.07.2024 is contrary to the orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.11091 of 2006 as well as the orders passed by the Commissioner, Survey, Settlement and

Land Records, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad in Revision Petition in File No.P5/3434/81 before dated 21.11.1983.

26. For the foregoing reasons, the impugned orders passed by respondent No.2 in both the writ petitions dated 24.07.2024 and 01.07.2024, rejecting the building permission applications of the petitioners are liable to be set aside and accordingly, set aside. Respondent No.2 is directed to consider the building permission applications submitted by the petitioners within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any view in respect of title over the subject properties.

27. With the above directions, the writ petitions are disposed of accordingly. No order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, pending if any, shall stand closed.

**J.SREENIVAS RAO, J**

Date: 04.03.2025

L.R. Copy to be marked

Note:

Issue C.C. in three (3) days.

(b/o)  
pgp/mar