

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR THE STATE OF
TELANGANA
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAGESH BHEEMAPAKA**

WRIT PETITION No. 325 OF 2026

13.07.2026

Between:

Sri Chandra Mohan Reddy Somi Reddy

..... Petitioner

And

Union Bank of India,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
New Delhi & others

..... Respondents

ORDER:

The present Writ petition is filed seeking a direction to Respondents 1 and 2 to consider the representation dated 09.12.2025 of petitioner pertaining to encroachments in Survey No. 126 of Injapur Village of Abdullapurmet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

2. The grievance of petitioner is that though it is brought to the notice of the official respondents about the illegal occupation and sale of government land in Survey No. 126 of Injapur Village, non-protection of valuable government land, large scale encroachments and illegal gratification for the

purpose of allowing such violations, Respondents have not taken any action regarding the same.

2.1. Petitioner states that he is the owner and peaceful possessor of Plot Nos. 30 and 31, admeasuring a total extent of 358 square yards in Survey Nos.117 and 118 of Injapur Village, Abdullapurmet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. According to petitioner, on the western side of his plots, an extent of Acs.74.00 of land is situated in Sy.No.126 and Writ Petition No. 35783 of 2025 was filed by him seeking redressal of his individual grievance concerning his plots.

2.2. It is categorically averred that there are large scale encroachments in Survey No. 126 of Injapur Village, with the collusion of the official respondents and political leaders. Respondents No. 14 - Tahsildar, Respondent No. 12 - the then Municipal Commissioner of Turkayamjal Municipality and Respondent No. 17 - Grama Palana Officer have been actively promoting the illegality. The case of petitioner is that there are several illegalities that have happened and have been happening in respect of the land in Survey No. 126 namely fraudulent alteration of layout records, deletion of original Gram Panchayat approved layout plans, removal of park and open space

designations from official records and manipulation of land documents.

2.3. It is also averred that illegal activities are allegedly being carried out with the involvement and support of official respondent 4 to 17 along with the active protection of local political leaders and their close associates and illegal building permissions were granted and construction activities are continuing, causing a huge loss to the government exchequer.

3. When Writ Petition was taken up for hearing, notice was ordered and the official respondents have been represented by their respective counsel. However, when the seriousness of the allegations made are pointed out, they made submissions borne out of written instructions/counter affidavits to the effect that no complaints have been received by them concerning Survey No. 126 of Injapur Village, therefore they remained silent and did not take any action.

4. The Writ Petition has undergone several adjournments on the request made by learned counsel appearing for respondents more particularly, learned Government Pleader for Revenue and when the counter affidavit of Respondents 13 to 16 was not forthcoming, a conditional

order was passed of appearance of the Secretary, Revenue in the event counter-affidavit is not filed by 09.04.2026. Consequent to the said order, the Collector, Ranga Reddy District (Respondent No.13) filed counter. Respondents 14 to 17 have not filed any counter, though serious allegations are made against them.

5. In the counter filed by Respondent No.13, it is averred that Revenue Divisional Officer, Ibrahimpatnam Division and Tahsildar, Abdullapurmet Mandal were directed to conduct detailed enquiry and submit report on the representation of petitioners. The reports submitted by them are not placed on record along with counter. However, it is averred in the counter at para 3 that total extent of land in Survey No. 126 of Injapur Village, Abdullapurmet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District is Acs.74-16 gts. and is recorded as "Sarkari". As per village map, the land bearing Survey No.126 is notified as "Jilavarkhan Cheruvu" and the rights and title are absolutely vested with the government.

5.1. In paragraph 5, respondents have furnished certain particulars purportedly based on the survey conducted by the field staff of the Tahsildar, Abdullapurmet Mandal. A perusal of the table annexed thereto discloses that, except for

the canal area shown at Sl. No.11 admeasuring Ac.1-12 guntas, the entire remaining extent is shown as being under the occupation of various entities. However, the counter- affidavit is conspicuously silent regarding the source, mode, date and authority under which such occupations came into existence. At Sl. No.1, Acs.22-00 is shown as occupied by HUDA. No particulars whatsoever have been furnished regarding alienation, transfer, allotment, or any government proceedings under which the said land came to be occupied by HUDA.

5.2. Likewise, in respect of Sl. Nos. 2 to 7, lands are shown as occupied by a Sub-Station, Indiramma Colony Houses, Graveyards, Temples, Z.P. Roads and other Roads, and 2-BHK Houses, however, no details are forthcoming regarding any assignment, transfer or other lawful authority enabling such occupation. In respect of Sl. No.8, existence of a Gouda Sangam Building is mentioned, but no details of any government alienation, allotment or permission in favour of the said Building have been disclosed. Similarly, at Sl. No.9, existence of a Dhobi Ghat is noted. However, the counter does not disclose any particulars regarding the authority under which the said land has been utilized for such purpose. In

respect of Sl. No.10, Acs.7-25 guntas is described as "Open Area (Agriculture)". The counter does not disclose the identity of person or persons cultivating the said land, nor does it specify nature of their possession, source of their right, or the authority under which such cultivation is being carried on. Sl. No.12 pertains to an admitted encroachment covered by a compound wall in an extent of Ac.1-19 guntas. Similarly, Sl. Nos.13, 14 and 15 are described as comprising godowns, existing sheds, existing houses and a water body. However, no particulars regarding ownership, possession, alienation, or authorization for such occupation have been furnished.

5.3. At Sl. No.16, Ac.0-03 guntas is alleged to be an encroachment by petitioner; at Sl. No.17, Ac.1-13 guntas is shown as "Apple Avenue (Part Area of Apartment)". At Sl. No.18, Ac.1-36 guntas is shown as comprising alleged encroachments in the form of Reddy Bhavanam, Temple, Houses, and Open Plots. At Sl. No.19, existing houses are shown in Survey No.126/2 admeasuring Acs.3-01 guntas. All these particulars shown *vide* Sl.Nos.1 to 19 are classified as Survey Nos.126/1/P and 126/2. The Sub Division particulars of Sy.No.126 have not been mentioned. Instead of furnishing complete particulars

regarding the large-scale occupations and encroachments reflected even in the table annexed to counter of the District Collector, respondents have chosen to divert attention from the core issue. The counter rather than explaining the legal basis for the occupation of vast extents of government land by various entities and individuals, proceeds to make allegations against petitioner.

5.4. A reading of paragraphs 6 to 12 of the counter demonstrates that respondents have concentrated almost exclusively on the alleged encroachment said to have been made by petitioner. The said averments do not answer the fundamental issue raised in the Writ Petition, namely, the unauthorized occupation and utilization of substantial extents of land comprised in Survey No. 126. Respondents have failed to disclose the particulars of alienation, allotment, assignment, regularization, or any lawful authority in favour of the numerous entities shown to be in occupation of the subject land. Instead, an undue emphasis has been placed upon the alleged encroachment by petitioner.

5.5. The approach adopted in the counter clearly reflects an attempt to vilify Petitioner and deflect attention from the

larger issue of unauthorized occupations and encroachments recorded by the Respondents themselves. Such an approach neither addresses the grievances raised in the Writ Petition nor justifies the inaction of the authorities in dealing with the extensive occupations reflected in their own records.

6. Petitioner filed reply to the said counter, specifically responding to the allegations made therein. He has categorically averred that, insofar as the dispute relating to his own land is concerned, he is independently pursuing his remedies before this Court through separate Writ Petitions. It is his specific case that the lands claimed by him are situated in Survey Nos.117 and 118 of Injapur Village.

7. Heard Sri A. Santosh Kumar, learned counsel assisted by Sri Naraparaju NSVLN Yashwanth, learned counsel for petitioner, Sri N. Bhujanga Rao, learned Deputy Solicitor General for Respondents 1 and 2, Sri Srinivas Kapatia, learned Special Public Prosecutor for CBI, learned Government Pleader for Revenue on behalf of Respondent No.4, learned Government Pleader for Home on behalf of Respondent No.6, learned Government Pleader for Forests on behalf of Respondent No.9, learned Government Pleader for Assignment on behalf of

Respondents 13 to 16, Sri V. Narasimha Goud, learned Standing Counsel for HMDA on behalf of Respondent No.11, Sri T. Bala Mohan Reddy, learned Special Public Prosecutor for ACB, Sri R. Sameer Ahmed, learned counsel for Respondent No.10 and Sri K. Laxmaiah, learned Standing Counsel for Respondent No.12.

8. On a perusal of the material on record, it is apparent that Respondents 4 to 17 are shielding the encroachers of valuable government land in Survey No.126 of Injapur Village, Abdullapurmet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. As per the counter of the District Collector, the entire land in Survey No. 126 to an extent of Acs.74-16 gts., Injapur Village, Abdullapurmet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District absolutely vests with the government. The Collector is the Revenue Head of the District and is bound to protect the government lands and is also required to take action administratively for any act of his subordinates for any dereliction of duty in respect of protection of government lands. Any lapse in this regard leads to heavy loss of exchequer to the State. Such a loss entails a direct bearing on the people of the State. It is also mentioned in the counter, as per the village map of Injapur Village, Survey No.126

is notified as Jilavarkhan Cheruvu meaning thereby that there is a water body, which has been encroached. However, the counter merely mentions the ground position existing as on date of filing of the counter but evades the more important questions as to how the land has been encroached and who is responsible for the same. The counter affidavit does not whisper about any enquiry in this regard. Instead, it focuses on the alleged encroachments made by petitioner. Petitioner has filed a reply to the counter filed by the Collector (R 13) along with photographs showing the geo coordinates of the various encroachments. Respondents have not replied to the averment made by petitioner and documents in nature of photographs substantiating the same. Therefore, it is to be treated that respondents have chosen to remain silent of those aspects.

9. It is also to be seen that from the date of filing of Writ Petition, it is to be perceived by the court that official Respondents 4 to 16 have tried to dodge the matter on one pretext or the other. The counter of the District Collector has been filed only after a conditional order of appearance of the Principal Secretary, Revenue was made. The submissions made by the counsel for the other official respondents namely

Respondents 6 to 12 also do not inspire confidence. The tenor of the said submissions is a stoic silence apparently willful blindness to the large scale encroachments as apparent from the counter filed by the District Collector.

10. The District Collector, in all fairness, is under a duty and responsibility towards the Court to lay all facts before the Court including action that has been taken against all the concerned for the encroachments in government land in Survey No.126 of Injapur Village, instead, the District Collector appears to have targeted towards petitioner. The only reasonable conclusion that can be drawn is that the State machinery is actively aiding the encroachment of government land at the cost of the government exchequer. The Court cannot be blind and a mute spectator to such a massive encroachment at the cost of public exchequer and blatant and willful attempt of Respondents 4 to 17 to keep the Court in dark and permit the encroachments to continue unabated. The Court has ample powers under Article 226 to enforce the rule of law by issuing appropriate directions.

11. Respondent No.3 in the counter stated that CBI is mandated to conduct any investigations as directed by the

Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble High Court and the same must be ordered sparingly, cautiously and only in exceptional circumstances, such as to instill confidence in the investigation, where the matter has national or international ramifications, or where it is necessary for doing complete justice and enforcing fundamental rights. It is also stated that indiscriminate directions would overburden the CBI, dilute its effectiveness and undermine its credibility.

12. Being conscious of the power of the Court to order an investigation by the CBI, it is to be seen whether the present case warrants investigation by the CBI into the large scale encroachments of an extent of Acs.74-16 gts in Survey No. 126 of Injapur Village, Abdullapurmet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. Normally, the Court would be slow to order an investigation by the CBI and conscious of the facts of limited resources so as not to burden the same. However, the present facts narrate and indicate active collusion by the Revenue Authorities and have miserably failed in protecting the landed resources of the government. On the one hand, the State has lost massive exchequer and on the other, the persons responsible for such encroachments have been enriched by an

illegal act. Such brazen acts have to be nipped in the bud and are to be dealt with seriously. It is apparent from the conduct of Respondents 13 to 17 that they are intentionally blind to the powers exercisable by the Court and seemed to convey that they can get away in spite of being responsible for the encroachments being done right under their nose. It is apparent that the stoic silence is only to allow the encroachments to continue.

13. Therefore, in order to ascertain the truth and fix responsibility for the legal encroachments, this Court, being conscious of the difficulty expressed by Respondent No.3 and with a view to upholding the rule of law and ensuring accountability of all the persons responsible, including public officials, who may have actively facilitated or connived in such encroachments, deemed it appropriate to direct a comprehensive enquiry.

14. Accordingly, Respondent No.6 – Director General of Police is directed to entrust the matter to the Crime Branch-Criminal Investigation Department (CBCID) for conducting a thorough enquiry into the involvement of all the officials concerned and private individuals in relation to encroachment

of land in Survey No. 126 of Injapur Village and to complete the enquiry within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

14.1. Further, the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department is directed to take immediate action against the persons responsible for not taking action to prevent encroachments in Survey No. 126, more particularly the officers at Mandal level i.e. Tahsildar (Respondent No. 14) and the Grama Palana Officer (Respondent No. 17), who are the first level Government Servants endowed with the responsibility to prevent and recover the encroached land and file a comprehensive report before this Court within four weeks from today.

15. The Writ Petition is disposed of in the above terms. No costs. Consequently, the miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

NAGESH BHEEMAPAKA, J

13th July 2026

ksld