

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

WRIT PETITION No. 22409 OF 2026

31.07.2026

Between:

N.V.N. Constructions Pvt. Ltd.,
Rep. by its Director K. NaveenKumar

..... Petitioner

And

The Southern Power Distribution Company of
Telangana Limited
Rep. by its Chairman and Managing Director
& others

..... Respondents

ORDER:

Heard Sri Dharmesh D.K. Jaiswal, learned counsel for petitioner, Sri N. Sreedhar Reddy, learned Standing Counsel for TGSPDCL, Sri S. Pushkar Jaiswal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of TG Pollution Control Board and with their consent, Writ Petition is taken up for hearing and final disposal at the stage of admission itself.

2. Petitioner claims to be the absolute owner and possessor of the subject land admeasuring Acs. 13.17 Guntas in Survey Nos. 1003 to 1006 of Kukatpally Village, Kukatpally Mandal (formerly Balanagar Mandal), Medchal-Malkajgiri

District (formerly Ranga Reddy District). It is stated, late Intivenka Balaiah was the original owner of the subject land, as is evident from the admitted records including the revenue records, and upon his demise, his sons, Intivenka Laxmaiah and others, succeeded to the subject land as his legal heirs. The subject land was declared surplus under the provisions of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976 (for short, 'the Act'). As Intivenka Laxmaiah and others did not have the means to pay the amounts required for regularization, they entered into a registered Agreement of Sale-cum-General Power of Attorney dated 07.08.2006 on the file of the Joint Sub-Registrar I, Office of the District Registrar, Ranga Reddy, in favour of Petitioner. Petitioner is stated to have paid Rs. 9,27,49,903 to the Government in the names of Intivenka Laxmaiah and others, whereupon the subject land was exempted and regularized under G.O.Ms. No. 469, Revenue Department, dated 26.03.2008, and regularization was conveyed by the endorsement dated 11.08.2008 issued by the competent authority. The said Agreement of Sale culminated in registered Sale Deed dated 19.07.2021, bearing Document No. 6595 of 2021, on the file of the Sub Registrar, Kukatpally, in favour of petitioner.

2.1. It is further stated, soon after execution of Agreement of Sale-cum-General Power of Attorney dated 07.08.2006, and upon being put in possession of the subject land, petitioner applied for and obtained electricity service connection to the subject land and the said connection in the name of petitioner, has been in existence and in continuous use from 2006. The bill for the month of July 2026 obtained from the official website of TGSPDCL in respect of the said service connection standing in the name of petitioner and covering Survey Nos. 1003 to 1006, evidences the subsisting supply of electricity to the subject land.

2.2. Petitioner states that survey records also stand confirmed in their favour; when revenue authorities sought to treat the subject land as overlapping with Khanamet Village on the strength of a survey conducted without notice to petitioner, this Court, in Writ Petition No. 30773 of 2021, by order dated 22.02.2022, held the unilateral overlapping survey in File No. A5/682/2010 dated 07.02.2014/17.02.2014 to be illegal and not binding, having noticed that the earlier surveys conducted on 31.05.2011 and 19.06.2018 found no overlapping of any survey number of Khanamet Village with the lands falling in Kukatpally Village, confirmed that subject land falls in Survey

Nos. 1003 to 1006 of Kukatpally Village, and restrained the authorities and anybody claiming through them from interfering with peaceful possession and enjoyment of petitioner over the subject land. The said order has attained finality. The operative portion of the said order reads as under:

“ In view of the above discussion, the writ petition is allowed holding that the impugned survey in File No.A5/682/2010 is not binding on the petitioner herein and to the extent of the land claimed by the petitioner it is held as illegal, bad and against the principles of natural justice. That the land admeasuring Acs.13.17 gts., claimed by the petitioner is falling in Sy.Nos.1003 to 1006 of Kukatpalli Village as evident from the Regularization Order under G.O.Ms.No.469 issued by the Government, the panchanama conducted pursuant thereto and also the finding of the Regional Deputy Director in File No.A5/143/2018, dated 19.06.2018. Therefore, the respondents or anybody claiming through them under the survey report, which is impugned in the present writ petition, cannot interfere with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the petitioner over the land to an extent of Acs.13.17 gts., in Sy.Nos.1003 to 1006 of Kukatpally Village and they are restrained from doing so. However, it is made clear that the findings and the directions given in this writ petition are confined to the extent of the land claimed by the writ petitioner only.”

2.3. It is stated that petitioner thereafter, applied for and obtained ‘No Objection Certificate’ from Irrigation Department *vide* proceedings dated 21.07.2022, issued by the Executive Engineer, North Tank Division, Secunderabad, and ‘No Objection Certificate’ from the Revenue Department *vide* proceedings dated 26.04.2023. Thereupon, the municipal

authorities granted building permission dated 07.12.2023 and petitioner was peacefully carrying on the development works on the subject land. It is stated that at this juncture, a speculative Writ Petition, being Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024 was filed by a third party against petitioner, falsely contending that a water body is situated in part of the subject land as per the topo sheet. The official respondents therein themselves conducted joint inspection as per the directions of this Court and filed report and also counter-affidavits admitting that there is no water body, Shikam or Tank on the subject land. This Court, by order dated 28.05.2025, dismissed the said Writ Petition with exemplary costs of Rs. 4,50,000/-, rejecting the theory of existence of water body on the basis of the topo sheet and the solitary entry in the revenue record, holding that the entire subject land is a patta land and stood exempted and regularized by the Government itself under G.O.Ms. No. 469 dated 26.03.2008 upon collection of Rs. 9,27,49,903 way back in 2008. The material portions of the said Order read as under:

“13. A perusal of proceedings dated 21.07.2022 and 08.07.2022 shows that Subject Lands are classified as Patta Lands and a Nala is passing adjacent to the said land towards its southern and eastern boundaries and in view of the same, a 2.0 meter buffer area totalling to an extent of Acs. 0-06 Guntas would have to be maintained. The above reports clearly reveal that barring the said buffer area, no FTL/Nalas are there in the subject land. NOC issued by the Revenue Department dated

26.04.2023 and its enclosure Lr. No. B/759/2023, dated 24.04.2023, reveal that there is no Government interest or no Nala or waterbody in the subject land.”

16. Petitioner states that as per Topographic Sheet, there is a waterbody in Survey No. 1006. Petitioner has not chosen to file the alleged Topographic Sheet on which he has placed reliance. Assuming that there exists such a Topographic Sheet, the same cannot be considered as evidence of a Waterbody/Shikam/Tank as no such reference of water body/Shikam/Tank is found in the village Map. Respondent No. 8 filed the village Map of Kukatpally Village. A perusal of the said village map shows that there is no waterbody/Shikam/Tank in Survey Nos. 1003 to 1006 as alleged. This fact has categorically been affirmed in the Joint Inspection Report, NOCs. and Counter Affidavits of the official Respondents. In the absence of a Waterbody/Shikam/Tank being shown in the Village Map in respect of subject land, the entry/reference with regards to a water body in the Topographic Sheet in respect of subject land, has no legal sanctity and need not be considered. The Topographic Sheet cannot be the basis for classification of the Subject Land or any part of it as Waterbody/Shikam/Tank. It is a common practice that farmers may use part of their lands for water storage purpose for cultivation. Further, it is a known phenomenon that the land is not always plain, certain extents are higher or lower in altitude than the other extents, in such a situation, when there are heavy rains, the low lying land gets inundated temporarily. Such water storage areas in private lands or inundations in private lands may be captured by the Topographic Sheet as a waterbody. Such entries/references cannot be treated as Waterbody/Shikam/Tank. The entries in Village Map always prevail over the entries in Topographic Sheet.

17. In view of the above, the entry of shikam in Khasra Pahani in respect of Survey No.1006 of Kukatpally Village and the entry/reference in Topographic sheet showing Subject Land as Water body/Tank/Shikam cannot be given credence or countenanced in law, more so when the departments themselves have filed counter affidavits/reports categorically stating that there is no trace of

Shikam/Tank/water body in the subject land. Therefore, the contention that in land bearing Survey Nos. 1003 to 1006 of Kukatpally Village, there is a water body/Shikam/Tank, as per Khasra Pahani/Topographic Sheet is untenable and is rejected.

18. A meaningful consideration of the entry in Khasra Pahani, in juxtaposition with the information under the RTI Act (including List of Tanks), ULC proceedings, NOCs. issued by the Irrigation and Revenue Departments, Joint Inspection Report, Counter Affidavit filed before this Court by Respondent No. 7, makes it crystal clear that there is no Tank/Shikam/Waterbody in the Subject Land as claimed by Petitioner. When the State departments i.e. Irrigation and CAD Department and Revenue Department categorically state that there is no Waterbody/Nala and give their respective NOCs, Petitioner cannot without any documentary evidence make a contrary claim.”

2.4. It is further stated that in the very same order, this Court, upon consideration of the order of this Court in Writ Petition No. 30773 of 2021, specifically rejected the contention that the purported tank in Survey No. 7 of Khanamet Village overlaps with the subject land, and while balancing the equities, confined any restoration of the alleged water body to Survey No. 7 of Khanamet Village or nearby Government land. Paragraphs 21 and 23 of the said order read as under:

“ 21. It is important to note that the aforesaid Order was passed against the State, revenue authorities and all the Survey Authorities categorically holding that there is no overlap between the lands in Khanamet Village including Survey No. 7 with the subject land. The said Order has attained finality. In view of the same, the contention that the purported Tank in Survey No. 7 of Khanamet Village overlaps with Survey No. 1003 to 1006 of Kukatpally Village is rejected being contrary to the Order passed by this Court and the earlier survey

reports. In the light of the above discussion, the Writ Petition is liable to be dismissed.”

23. It is needless to mention that since the entire subject land i.e. Survey Nos. 1003 to 1006 of Kukatpally Village and Mandal, Medchal-Malkajgiri District was exempted / regularised by the government itself under G.O.Ms.No. 469 by collecting a huge sum of Rs.9,27,49,903/- way back on 26.03.2008 balancing the equities, though it is held that the subject land cannot be claimed as a water body / shikam / tank, the official respondents are not prevented in taking steps to restore the water body claimed to be in Survey No.7 of Khanamet Village, if it ever existed. In the process, if the authorities are unable to restore the water body in Survey No. 7 of Khanamet Village, due to any reason, but not limited to defective survey records or overlapping issues, the official respondents may restore the water body in nearby government land.”

The order dated 28.05.2025 in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024 has also attained finality. Registry has recorded, by way of a note appended to the certified copy of the said order, that costs imposed thereunder, as modified by order dated 17.07.2025 in Review I.A. No. 5 of 2025 have been complied with *vide* USR No. 96290, Memo dated 08.09.2025.

2.5. It is stated that notwithstanding the aforesaid binding orders, the revenue officials continued to interfere with the subject land by falsely asserting that it is Government land or that it contains a water body. Constrained by the said continued interference, petitioner submitted a detailed representation dated 06.02.2026 to the Principal Secretary,

Revenue Department, Government of Telangana, narrating the entire sequence of facts, enclosing relevant documents and seeking suitable directions to the authorities concerned not to interfere with the subject land and to comply with the binding orders of this Court. No action whatsoever was taken on the said representation.

2.6. It is stated that, on the contrary, ignoring the said representation and relying upon the very same topo sheet, the Hyderabad Disaster Response and Assets Protection Agency (HYDRAA), along with the revenue authorities, entered upon the subject land on 25.05.2026 and 26.05.2026 without any notice whatsoever, demolished and destroyed the compound fencing along the entire perimeter, the security rooms and the entry gate, caused extensive damage to the property and the machinery stationed thereon, and Respondents 1 and 2 highhandedly disconnected the electricity supply to the subject land. Aggrieved by the said highhanded action, petitioner filed Contempt Case Nos. 2395, 2396 and 2397 of 2026 before this Court. By a detailed common order dated 29.05.2026 in I.A. No. 1 of 2026 in the said contempt cases, this Court held that a strong *prima facie* case of wilful disobedience of the Orders of this Court and of breach of the undertaking recorded therein

had been made out, and directed respondents therein to forthwith restore the subject land to the state and condition in which it existed immediately prior to 25.05.2026, within 24 hours, failing which petitioner was granted liberty to undertake restoration works at the cost of respondents therein, and further restrained respondents, their officers, servants and agents from causing interference with the possession and enjoyment of the subject land pending disposal of the contempt cases. The relevant portions of the common Order dated 29.05.2026 read as under:

“12. The stand now taken by the respondents / contemnors is contrary to their stand as recorded in the Order and their own pleadings in W.P. No. 22143 of 2024, wherein the official authorities themselves filed counter affidavits admitting that there is no water body, Shikam or Tank on the subject land. This Court in its order dated 28.05.2025, held that the subject land stands regularised under G.O. Ms. No. 469 and is not a water body, Shikam or Tank, and dismissed the writ petition with exemplary costs. Having admitted on oath that the subject land is not a water body, Shikam or Tank, the respondents / contemnors cannot now take a contrary stand to justify the demolition and dispossession complained of more so without following the principles of natural justice. This shift in their stand strengthens the prima facie case of the petitioner.”

15. In the result, and for the reasons recorded above, the respondents / contemnors, jointly and severally, are directed to forthwith restore the subject land, namely the open land admeasuring Acres. 13.17 Guntas in Sy. Nos. 1003 to 1006 situated at Kukatpally Village and Mandal (earlier Balanagar Mandal), Medchal-Malkajgiri District (earlier Ranga Reddy District), to the state and condition in

which it existed immediately prior to 25.05.2026, by undoing each and every act of demolition, dispossession, destruction and illegal occupation, including by reinstating the compound fencing along the entire perimeter, reconstructing the tin-sheet security rooms and the entry gate, restoring all electricity service lines, lighting infrastructure and allied electrical installations, removing all fencing and signage or boards erected by the respondents / contemnors or by the revenue authorities, withdrawing all personnel of the HYDRAA, revenue officials and all persons claiming through them from the subject land, ensuring the safety of all machinery, equipment and materials of the petitioner remaining thereon, and restoring to the petitioner peaceful possession and unhindered access to the subject land, forthwith and in any event not later than 24 (twenty four) hours from the receipt of a copy of this order. Upon failure of the respondents / contemnors to effect compliance within the stipulated period, the petitioner is granted liberty to undertake the said restoration works, and all costs, charges and expenses incurred therein shall be quantified and recovered from the respondents / contemnors from their personal funds. Further, the respondents / contemnors, their officers, servants, agents and all persons acting under their authority are restrained from causing interference with the petitioner's possession and enjoyment of the subject land in any manner, pending disposal of these contempt cases."

2.7. It is stated that the order dated 29.05.2026 was not complied with by the authorities within the stipulated period, and acting upon the liberty granted under the second limb of the said order, petitioner commenced restoration works on the subject land. When the contempt cases came up before this Court on 04.06.2026, learned Standing Counsel appearing for HYDRAA submitted that respondents therein are not causing any interference with the restoration works being carried out at

the subject land, and this Court recorded the said submission in its order dated 04.06.2026 in Contempt Case Nos. 2395 and 2396 of 2026, in the following terms:

“ Further, recording the submission of learned Standing Counsel for HYDRAA that Respondents are not interfering with the restoration works being carried out by Petitioner at the subject land, this Court deems it appropriate to adjourn the matters for filing counters.”

2.8. It is stated, Respondents 1 and 2, pursuant to the Orders passed in the contempt cases, initially restored the electricity supply to subject land, which supply is in existence as on date. However, despite the aforesaid series of Orders against the State and its instrumentalities, Respondents 1 and 2 are now once again threatening to disconnect the electricity supply to the subject land on the ground that Respondents 3 and 4 have orally instructed them that, as per the topo sheet, a water body exists in the midst of the subject land. No notice of any nature has been issued to petitioner and the threatened disconnection is sought to be effected purely on the strength of an oral instruction. It is stated further that when the representatives of petitioner inquired into the issue, they were orally informed by the officials of Respondents 3 and 4 that, as per the topo sheet and other satellite maps, there is a water body in the midst of the subject land, that ‘No Objection

Certificate' issued by the Irrigation Department was obtained during the tenure of the previous Government and is not valid, and a fresh 'No Objection Certificate' has to be obtained under the present Government to establish that there is no water body in the subject land, since the Irrigation 'NOC' was issued more than three years ago. It is stated that on 10.07.2026, the officials of Respondents 3 and 4 visited the subject land, as per their records, a water body exists in the midst of the subject land, they had received a complaint in that regard, and conveyed that on the strength of the said complaint all further activity on the said land is to be stopped. The said visit and threat, without any notice, order or proceeding whatsoever, and in reagitation of the very contentions which stand judicially negated by the binding orders of this Court, have rendered the apprehension of petitioner real and imminent.

2.9. It is further stated that petitioner has reliably come to learn that an improved and altogether new case is sought to be projected on behalf of Respondents, ie. that a water body by name Edula Kunta, stated to be situated in Survey No. 7 of Khanamet Village, Serilingampally Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, forms part of the subject land, purportedly on the strength of the topo sheet of the Survey of India, decades old

satellite imagery and a unilateral demarcation of the boundaries of the said Survey No. 7 of Khanamet Village, without any notice to petitioner. The said stand is asserted to be *ex facie* untenable for the following reasons: (i) subject land falls in Survey Nos. 1003 to 1006 of Kukatpally Village and Mandal, Medchal Malkajgiri District, whereas Survey No. 7 of Khanamet Village falls in a different village, a different mandal and a different district altogether, and this Court, in Writ Petition No. 30773 of 2021, held the unilateral survey conducted without notice to be illegal and not binding, recorded that the surveys conducted earlier on 31.05.2011 and 19.06.2018 found no overlapping of any survey number of Khanamet Village with the subject land, and confirmed that the subject land falls in Survey Nos. 1003 to 1006 of Kukatpally Village; (ii) the alleged water body by name Edula Kunta never existed on the ground and does not figure in the list of lakes maintained by the Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority, as per which the only lakes in Khanamet Village are Khanamet Cheruvu (Lake ID 3732) and Mondi Kunta (Lake ID 3700/E/12) and an extract of the said list is placed on record; (iii) in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024, this Court itself proceeded on the footing that the alleged water body, if it ever existed, lies outside the subject land, and

confined any steps of restoration to Survey No. 7 of Khanamet Village or nearby Government land; and (iv) decades old satellite imagery and the topo sheet cannot override the village maps, and this Court has categorically held that temporary inundations in private lands captured in a topographic sheet cannot be treated as a water body, Shikam or Tank, and that the entries in the village map always prevail over the entries in the topo sheet.

2.10. It is finally stated that there is a consistent series of judicial orders in favour of petitioner, namely order dated 22.02.2022 in Writ Petition No. 30773 of 2021, order dated 28.05.2025 in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024, order dated 03.09.2024 in I.A. No. 1 of 2024 in W.P. No. 24204 of 2024, and orders dated 29.05.2026 and 04.06.2026 in the contempt cases referred to above, and that no department or instrumentality of the State is entitled to act in violation of the said Orders, directly or indirectly, or to reagitate contentions which stand judicially concluded. Unless the impugned actions are declared illegal, petitioner apprehends that it would be exposed to repeated objections of a like nature at the hands of one department or the other at every successive stage of the project,

including at the stage of grant of further statutory approvals and clearances, on the very grounds which stand negated.

3. Respondents 1 and 2, through their learned Standing Counsel, contend that electricity supply to the subject land was initially disconnected on the instructions of HYDRAA; in due compliance with the orders of this Court in the contempt proceedings, electricity supply was restored, and since such restoration, Respondents 1 and 2 have not interfered with the subject land in any manner and are not going to disconnect the power supply to the subject land.

4. Respondent No. 3 - Telangana State Pollution Control Board, has placed on record its written instructions, as per which, O.A. No. 74 of 2026 has been filed by Human Rights and Consumer Protection Cell Trust and another against the State of Telangana and others before the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal, Southern Zone, Chennai, seeking protection, restoration and prevention of further encroachments and illegal drainage of a Government recorded water body described as Edulakunta Lake (Sarkari Cheruvu), stated to be situated in Survey No. 7 (Shikam), with its Full Tank Level and buffer zone stated to be extending into Survey Nos. 6, 8 and 9 of Khanamet Village, Serilingampally Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

4.1. It is further stated on behalf of Respondent No. 3 that a Committee constituted by the National Green Tribunal, comprising officials of the Revenue Department (the Tahsildar, Serilingampally) and of the Board (the Environmental Engineer, Regional Office, Ranga Reddy District), visited the area on 07.07.2026 in compliance with the orders passed by the National Green Tribunal in O.A. No. 74 of 2026, and that the plea of the applicant therein is under examination. It is further stated, the Committee constituted by the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal has only inspected the area in compliance with the orders passed by the Tribunal in O.A. No. 74 of 2026 and the allegations of interference are incorrect and Respondent No. 3 has not interfered with the subject land. It is further stated on behalf of Respondent No. 3 that it has not asked TGSPDCL to disconnect power supply or violated/come in the way of the Orders of this Court.

5. Respondent No. 4 - State Level Environmental Impact Assessment Authority, has placed on record its written instructions. As per the said instructions, petitioner and others applied for Terms of Reference (TOR) on 11.11.2024 on the PARIVESH portal maintained by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEF&CC), Government of India,

for the proposed construction of a Complex in Survey Nos. 1003, 1004, 1005 and 1006 at Kukatpally Village and Mandal, Medchal Malkajgiri District, Telangana. The Standard Terms of Reference were accordingly issued on 14.11.2024, with an additional condition in the following terms:

“ As per the KML file, stream is passing from the proposed site, the I&CAD NOC submitted by the project proponent is quite old and issued by the Executive engineer, irrigation department but not signed by the other members of the joint inspection team. The NOC may be revalidated and submitted accordingly”.

5.1. It is further stated that petitioner subsequently applied for Environmental Clearance on 29.09.2025 on PARIVESH portal, and the proposal was reviewed by the State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) on 16.10.2025. However, as the project proponent did not attend the meeting, the proposal was deferred by the SEAC, and it is expressly recorded in the written instructions that no adverse decision was taken. The proposal was raised with Additional Details Sought (ADS) on the portal, stating that “The SEAC deferred the project, as the proponent did not attend the meeting”.

5.2. It is further stated that as the project proponent did not thereafter respond, the proposal was automatically delisted by the PARIVESH portal maintained by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change on 28.01.2026.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner advanced the following submissions:

Firstly, *prima facie* title and possession of subject land stand established through regularization under G.O.Ms. No. 469 dated 26.03.2008 upon payment of Rs. 9,27,49,903/-, endorsement dated 11.08.2008, registered Sale Deed dated 19.07.2021, electricity service connection subsisting in the name of petitioner from 2006 and confirmation of survey by this Court in Writ Petition No. 30773 of 2021, which order has attained finality. Secondly, every department concerned issued its 'No Objection Certificate', the Irrigation Department by proceedings dated 21.07.2022 and the Revenue Department by proceedings dated 26.04.2023, whereafter the municipal building permission dated 07.12.2023 was granted. The State, having acted upon these 'No Objection Certificates', cannot now resile from them. Thirdly, the water body plea founded on the topo sheet was raised by a third party in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024 and was rejected by a detailed judgment with exemplary costs, the official respondents therein having themselves admitted on oath, through the joint inspection report and their counter affidavits, that there is no water body, Shikam or Tank in the subject land, Respondents cannot reagitate the concluded

issue. Fourthly, despite all of this, when the State interfered with the subject land on 25.05.2026 and 26.05.2026, contempt cases were filed, order dated 29.05.2026 directed restoration within 24 hours and restrained interference, and order dated 04.06.2026 recorded the submission that no interference would be caused. The renewed threat of disconnection is nothing but an attempt to achieve indirectly what the State stands restrained from doing directly. Fifthly, the National Green Tribunal cannot re-hear or re-determine an issue already concluded by this Court, and the interference of the Respondents under cover of the proceedings before the Tribunal is wholly unjustified.

7. Learned counsel further submitted that the alleged Edula Kunta finds no place in the list of lakes maintained by the Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority for Khanamet Village, and a water body cannot come into legal existence by inference from an image, without any statutory notification or determination.

8. Learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 has contended before this Court that electricity supply has been restored in compliance with the orders of this Court in the contempt cases and the contention of petitioner that there is

threat of disconnection which persists and is real and imminent is not true and denied.

9. On behalf of learned Standing Counsel for Respondent No. 3, reiterating the stand taken in the written instructions, it is contended that a committee constituted by the National Green Tribunal, comprising of the Tahsildar, Serilingampally and the Environmental Engineer, Regional Office, Ranga Reddy District, visited the area on 07.07.2026 in compliance with the orders passed by the National Green Tribunal in O.A. No. 74 of 2026, which was filed seeking protection, restoration and prevention of further encroachments and illegal drainage of a Government recorded water body described as Edulakunta Lake (Sarkari Cheruvu), stated to be situated in Survey No. 7 (Shikam), with its Full Tank Level and buffer zone stated to be extending into Survey Nos. 6, 8 and 9 of Khanamet Village, Serilingampally Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. It is further submitted that Respondent No. 3 never interfered with the possession of petitioner or instructed Respondents 1 and 2 to disconnect the electricity. Further, Respondent No. 3 has never violated/come in the way of the Orders passed by this Court and would continue to abide by the Orders of this Court.

10. On behalf of learned Standing Counsel for Respondent No. 4, reiterating the stand taken in the written instructions, it is contended that petitioner and others applied for Terms of Reference (TOR) on 11.11.2024 on the PARIVESH for the proposed construction over the subject land. The Standard Terms of Reference were accordingly issued on 14.11.2024, with an additional condition that as a stream is passing from the proposed site, I & CAD NOC submitted by the project proponent is quite old and issued by the Executive engineer, irrigation department but not signed by the other members of the joint inspection team. The NOC may be revalidated and submitted accordingly.

10.1. It is further contended that Application for Environmental Clearance was made on 29.09.2025 on the PARIVESH portal, and was reviewed by the State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) on 16.10.2025. However, as the project proponent did not attend the meeting, the proposal was deferred by the SEAC, and it is expressly recorded in the written instructions that no adverse decision was taken. The proposal was raised with Additional Details Sought (ADS) on the portal, stating that 'The SEAC deferred the project, as the proponent did not attend the meeting'. It is further contended that, as the

project proponent did not thereafter respond, the proposal was automatically delisted by the PARIVESH portal maintained by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change on 28.01.2026.

11. In rejoinder to the submissions made on behalf of Respondents, learned counsel for petitioner submitted as follows:

The threat of disconnection persists and is real and imminent, as evidenced by the site visit of 07.07.2026 by the officials of Respondents 3 and 4. The National Green Tribunal cannot decide afresh an issue that has attained finality by the orders of this Court. This Court has categorically rejected the evidentiary worth of the topo sheet of the Survey of India and of satellite material, and has, at Paragraph 23 of the order in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024, given categorical directions confining any restoration of the alleged water body to Survey No. 7 of Khanamet Village or nearby Government land. The contention that 'No Objection Certificate' lapses by passage of time is untenable. The objection that 'No Objection Certificate' bears only the signature of the Executive Engineer, and not the signatures of the other members of the joint inspection team, is equally untenable; 'No Objection Certificate' was issued after

due inspection and on the basis of the reports of the Tahsildar and of the Irrigation Department, and it was preceded by the joint inspection of the Mandal Surveyor and the Assistant Engineer of the Irrigation Department, as recorded in the order dated 28.05.2025 in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024. The office of the District Collector, the revenue head of the District, issued a separate 'NOC'. The aforesaid 'NOCs' were acted upon for grant of municipal permission and stands judicially-accepted in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024 and is fortified by the statement made on behalf of the State by the learned Special Government Pleader in the said Writ Petition that there is no tank, shikam or water body in the subject land. A belated objection of this nature, raised for the first time years later and after 'No Objection Certificate' has been acted upon, cannot denude the 'No Objection Certificate' of its validity or efficacy. The additional condition in the Terms of Reference dated 14.11.2024 requiring revalidation of 'No Objection Certificate', and the premise of the said condition, namely that a stream is passing from the proposed site as per the KML file, stands concluded against the State by the Order of this Court dated 28.05.2025, which records on the strength of the State's own proceedings that only a Nala passes adjacent to the subject land towards its southern

and eastern boundaries, in respect whereof a buffer area of six guntas is to be maintained, and that barring the said buffer area, no Full Tank Level or Nalas exist in the subject land. Therefore, such a condition is untenable and cannot be imposed in respect of the subject land.

12. Upon consideration of the pleadings, the material on record and the rival submissions, the following points arise for consideration:

Point No. 1: Whether the Petitioner has established prima facie title to and possession of the subject land?

Point No. 2: Whether the orders of this Court passed against the State bind all its functionaries, and whether any department or instrumentality of the State can claim exemption therefrom?

Point No. 3: Whether the issues sought to be raised, namely the alleged water body Edula Kunta, the alleged overlap with Khanamet Village, and the evidentiary worth of the topo sheet and satellite imagery, stand concluded by the binding orders of this Court, and what is the effect thereof vis a vis the proceedings pending before the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal?

Point No. 4: Whether the insistence of Respondent No. 4 upon a fresh or revalidated No Objection Certificate is sustainable in law?

Point No. 5: Whether the threatened disconnection of the electricity supply to the subject land is sustainable in law?

13. **POINT No. 1:**

The record before this Court establishes, beyond the threshold required in proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, *prima facie* title and possession of petitioner over the subject land. The chain begins with ownership of Late Intivenka Balaiah and succession of his sons, Intivenka Laxmaiah and others. The subject land, having been declared surplus under the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976, was exempted and regularized by the Government itself under G.O.Ms. No. 469, Revenue Department, dated 26.03.2008, upon collection of Rs. 9,27,49,903 paid by petitioner in the names of Intivenka Laxmaiah and others, and regularization was conveyed by the endorsement dated 11.08.2008. The said G.O. No. 469, dated 26.03.2008, had stood the test of time and attained finality. The registered Agreement of Sale-cum-General Power of Attorney dated 07.08.2006, bearing Document No. 16132 of 2006, culminated in the registered Sale Deed dated 19.07.2021, bearing Document No. 6595 of 2021. It is significant that the State itself, upon receipt of the aforesaid substantial consideration, treated the subject land as private patta land, a position reflected in the report of the Tahsildar, Kukatpally Mandal dated

24.04.2023, which records the pahani entries showing the subject land as patta land, exemption under Section 20(1) of the Act and the sale in favour of petitioner.

14. The possession of petitioner is equally well borne out. The electricity service connection bearing S.C. No. 12001 03159 and Unique Service Connection No. 102155412 has stood in the name of petitioner and has been in continuous use from 2006, and the bill for July 2026 evidences a subsisting supply. The order dated 22.02.2022 in Writ Petition No. 30773 of 2021, which has attained finality, whereunder the unilateral overlapping survey in File No. A5/682/2010 dated 07.02.2014/17.02.2014 was held to be illegal, bad and contrary to the principles of natural justice on the strength of the earlier surveys dated 31.05.2011 and 19.06.2018. It was further held that the subject land falls in Survey Nos. 1003 to 1006 of Kukatpally Village and the authorities and anybody claiming through them were restrained from interfering with peaceful possession and enjoyment of petitioner. The 'No Objection Certificates' of the Irrigation Department dated 21.07.2022 and of the Revenue Department dated 26.04.2023, and the building permission dated 07.12.2023, followed. When petitioner was dispossessed/disturbed by the events of 25.05.2026 and

26.05.2026, this Court, by the common order dated 29.05.2026, directed restoration of subject land to its original state within 24 hours, and possession was in fact, resumed by petitioner, which commenced restoration works under the liberty granted by this Court, as recorded in the order dated 04.06.2026.

15. The cumulative effect of the regularization granted by the Government itself upon collection of a substantial sum, registered instruments of title, subsisting electricity connection of two decades, the concluded survey proceedings, 'No Objection Certificates' and the municipal permission, and the successive orders of this Court protecting and restoring possession, all of which attained finality, is that petitioner established *prima facie* title to and possession of the subject land. Point No. 1 is accordingly answered in affirmative and in favour of petitioner.

16. **POINT No. 2:**

The next question is whether the orders of this Court passed against the State bind every functionary and instrumentality of the State, or whether a department which was not *eo nomine* a party to the earlier proceedings can treat itself as free of them. The question is no longer *res integra*. This Court, in the common order dated 10.06.2026 in I.A. Nos. 1 of 2026 in Contempt Case Nos. 2447 and 2448 of 2026, dealing

with a materially-identical situation in which an instrumentality of the State entered upon private property protected by orders of this Court on the strength of a complaint of a third party, held as under:

“ 19. It is not contemplated by the framers of the Constitution that two departments of a State would act in a manner detrimental to the interest of public or violate the law, when one of them is not a party to earlier proceedings before the Court, on the ground that the order of the Court is not directed towards them. It is settled principle of law that various departments of Government are its limbs and they must act in coordination.

20. This Court has no hesitation to hold that if any of the Law Offices of the Court through its officers i.e., Offices of Chief Law Officer of the State/Additional Advocate General's Office/Special Government Pleader's Offices/Government Pleader's Offices/Assistant Government Pleaders/Standing Counsels, undertake that State authorities would comply with the orders passed by a Court of law, it would bind “every department”, unless one of the departments has a grievance valid in law.”

17. The principle so laid down commends itself to this Court and squarely governs the present case. The State is one juristic entity. Its departments, instrumentalities, agencies and officers are its limbs, and none of them enjoys a juridical existence apart from the State when it comes to obedience of judicial orders passed against the State. An order passed against the State binds every department, instrumentality, agency and officer of the State, without exception, whether or

not the particular department was arrayed by name in the earlier proceeding. Were it otherwise, the State would be able to nullify every adverse adjudication by the simple expedient of deploying, one after another, a department not named in the earlier cause title, each raising afresh the very contention concluded against the State. To permit one department after another to raise, in succession, contentions concluded against the State would reduce the orders of this Court to a dead letter and would strike at the very root of the rule of law. It is equally settled that what cannot be done directly cannot be done indirectly, the State cannot accomplish through the agency of Respondent Nos. 1 and 2, or under the cover of the inspection of Respondent No. 3, or by the insistence of Respondent No. 4, that which the State and its instrumentalities stand restrained by this Court from doing.

18. To this must be added the judicial estoppel operating against the State on the facts of this very matter. In Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024, the official respondents, upon the directions of this Court, conducted a joint inspection of the subject land and filed the joint inspection report and counter affidavits on oath categorically admitting that there is no water body, Shikam or Tank on the subject land. This Court, in the

common order dated 29.05.2026 in Contempt Cases No. 2395, 2396 and 2397 of 2026, held in terms, at Paragraph 12 extracted hereinabove, that having admitted on oath that subject land is not a water body, Shikam or Tank, respondents therein cannot now take a contrary stand. That holding binds the State and each of its limbs, including Respondents herein. A litigant, and a fortiori the State, cannot approbate and reprobate, having secured the dismissal of the challenge in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024 on the strength of its own sworn admissions and reports, the State cannot, through any of its departments, now assert the contrary.

19. Point No. 2 is accordingly answered holding that the orders of this Court passed against the State bind all the functionaries, departments, instrumentalities and agencies of the State without exception, that none of them is entitled to claim exemption therefrom or to raise afresh contentions concluded against the State, and Respondents herein stand bound by the orders dated 22.02.2022 in Writ Petition No. 30773 of 2021, 28.05.2025 in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024, 03.09.2024 in I.A. No. 1 of 2024 in Writ Petition No. 24204 of 2024, and 29.05.2026 and 04.06.2026 in the contempt cases, in the same measure as the parties named therein.

20. **POINT No. 3:**

The third point concerns the conclusiveness of the findings of this Court on the very issues now sought to be revived, and the effect of such conclusiveness *vis a vis* the proceedings pending before the National Green Tribunal.

21. The principle of law is well-settled by the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of Andhra Pradesh v. Raghu Ramakrishna Raju Kanumuru (M.P.)***, Civil Appeal Nos. 4522 to 4524 of 2022, reported in (2022)8 SCC 156. Dealing with conflicting orders of the National Green Tribunal and of the High Court in respect of the same cause of action, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:

“ 11. In any case, no law is necessary to state that insofar as the Tribunals are concerned, they would be subordinate to the High Court insofar as the territorial jurisdiction of the High Court is concerned. A reference in this respect was also made to the judgment of the Constitution Bench of this Court in the case of *L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India and Others*.

12. We are, therefore, of the considered view that it was not appropriate on the part of the learned NGT to have continued with the proceedings before it, specifically, when it was pointed that the High Court was also in seisin of the matter and had passed an interim order permitting the construction. The conflicting orders passed by the learned NGT and the High Court would lead to an anomalous situation, where the authorities would be faced with a difficulty as to which order they are required to follow. There can be no manner of doubt that in such a situation, it is the orders passed by the constitutional courts,

which would be prevailing over the orders passed by the statutory tribunals.”

22. The National Green Tribunal is a statutory Tribunal constituted under the National Green Tribunal Act, 2010. Within the territorial jurisdiction of a High Court, it is subordinate to the High Court, and its orders must yield to the orders of the constitutional Court. It follows, as a general proposition of law, that once an issue has been judicially determined by the High Court and determination has attained finality, the National Green Tribunal cannot re-determine the said issue or sit over the findings of the High Court, whether directly or by receiving afresh, at the instance of a different applicant, the very material and the very contentions which the High Court has considered and rejected. The doctrine of *res judicata*, and its underlying public policy that there must be an end to litigation and that no person shall be vexed twice over the same matter, applies with full vigour to proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution and the findings recorded therein bind the State and all persons claiming through or under it.

23. Turning to the record, the issues now sought to be raised stand concluded in the following manner:

24. Firstly, as to the alleged overlap with Khanamet Village, the order dated 22.02.2022 in Writ Petition No. 30773 of

2021 declared the unilateral overlapping survey in File No. A5/682/2010 dated 07.02.2014/17.02.2014 as illegal and violative of the principles of natural justice, recorded that the earlier surveys dated 31.05.2011 and 19.06.2018 found no overlapping of any survey number of Khanamet Village with the lands falling in Kukatpally Village, and confirmed that the subject land falls in Survey Nos. 1003 to 1006 of Kukatpally Village. That order attained finality. The question of overlap between the subject land and Khanamet Village, including Survey No. 7 thereof, therefore stands judicially concluded.

24.1. Secondly, as to the evidentiary worth of the topo sheet of Survey of India, the order dated 28.05.2025 in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024 specifically considered the plea of a water body founded on the topo sheet and held, in the passages extracted hereinabove, that a topographic entry which is at variance with the village map has no legal sanctity and need not be considered, that the topographic sheet cannot be the basis for the classification of the subject land or any part of it as a water body, Shikam or Tank, that temporary inundation of low lying private land captured on a topographic sheet cannot be treated as a water body, and that the entries in the village map always prevail over the entries in the topographic sheet. The

reasoning applies *mutatis mutandis* to every other form of satellite imagery, including any KML file or satellite derived material. An image, of whatever vintage, merely captures the surface appearance of land on a given date. It is not self proving, it cannot delineate cadastral boundaries or survey numbers, and it cannot determine the legal classification of land, which is governed by the village map and the statutory revenue record. The said Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024, in which the very plea of a water body or Shikam in the subject land was raised, was dismissed with exemplary costs, upon the State's own joint inspection report and sworn counter affidavits, and that order too attained finality, the costs having been deposited as recorded by the Registry.

24.2. Thirdly, Paragraph 23 of the order dated 28.05.2025, extracted hereinabove, itself confines any restoration of the alleged water body, if it ever existed, to Survey No. 7 of Khanamet Village or to nearby Government land. By the very terms of the said direction, any exercise of restoration of the alleged water body can never extend to the subject land. Fourth, the alleged Edula Kunta finds no place in the list of lakes maintained by the Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority for Khanamet Village, the extract whereof placed on

record reflects only two lakes i.e. Khanamet Cheruvu (Lake ID 3732) and Mondi Kunta (Lake ID 3700/E/12). A water body does not come into legal existence by inference from an image or a complaint, it must be found in the statutory record, and where the constitutional court has, upon the sworn material of the State itself, concluded that no water body, Shikam or Tank exists on the subject land, the matter is at an end so far as the subject land is concerned. Therefore, the claim of water body of any description, including any purported "Edula Kunta," exists on the subject land, is rejected in toto.

25. This Court also takes on record the stand of Respondent No. 3 that the Committee constituted by the National Green Tribunal only inspected the area on 07.07.2026 in compliance with the orders of the Tribunal, the Board never asked TGSPDCL to disconnect the power supply, and the Board has neither violated nor come in the way of the orders of this Court and has not interfered with the subject land. In view of the said stand, taken in writing before this Court, no functionary of Respondent No. 3 can act to the contrary. The findings of this Court in Writ Petition No. 30773 of 2021 and Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024, which have attained finality, conclude the questions of the alleged overlap of the subject land

with Khanamet Village, of the existence of any water body, Shikam or Tank on the subject land, and of the evidentiary worth of the topo sheet and satellite imagery qua the subject land, and that, as a general proposition of law, a statutory tribunal cannot re-determine or sit over issues so concluded by a constitutional Court.

26. Point No. 3 is answered accordingly in affirmative, by holding that (i) that the subject land falls in Survey Nos. 1003 to 1006 of Kukatpally Village and does not overlap with Khanamet Village or Survey No. 7 thereof, as concluded by the order dated 22.02.2022 in W.P. No. 30773 of 2021, (ii) that no water body, Shikam or Tank, including any purported "Edula Kunta," exists on the subject land, and that the topo sheet and satellite imagery, including any KML file or satellite derived material, have no evidentiary worth to classify the subject land or any part thereof as a water body, as held in the order dated 28.05.2025 in W.P. No. 22143 of 2024 and (iii) that any restoration of the alleged water body, if it ever existed, is confined to Survey No. 7 of Khanamet Village or nearby Government land, and can never extend to the subject land, as per the express terms of Paragraph 23 of the said order dated 28.05.2025. In view of the above, the NGT is requested to pass

necessary Orders in O.A. No. 74 of 2026 pending before it, by giving the due precedence, weightage and consideration to the findings of this Court in the present case as well as Order dated 22.02.2022 in Writ Petition No. 30773 of 2021, Order dated 28.05.2025 in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024, Order dated 03.09.2024 in I.A. No. 1 of 2024 in Writ Petition No. 24204 of 2024, and Orders dated 29.05.2026 and 04.06.2026 in the contempt cases referred to above, as mandated by the law declared by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of Andhra Pradesh v. Raghu Ramakrishna Raju Kanumuru (M.P.) (supra)***.

27. **POINT No. 4:**

The fourth point concerns the insistence of Respondent No. 4 upon a fresh or revalidated 'No Objection Certificate'. As is evident from the written instructions of Respondent No. 4 recorded hereinabove, the said insistence rests upon the additional condition incorporated in the Terms of Reference dated 14.11.2024 and comprises three aspects, firstly, 'No Objection Certificate' of the Irrigation Department dated 21.07.2022 is quite old. Second, that the said certificate is signed only by the Executive Engineer, Irrigation Department, and not by the other members of the joint inspection team,

third, that as per the KML file, a stream is passing from the proposed site and is therefore to be revalidated.

28. As to the first aspect, the 'No Objection Certificate' dated 21.07.2022 prescribes no period of validity. A valid administrative act, lawfully completed, is not undone by the mere efflux of time. As to the second aspect, the record demonstrates that 'No Objection Certificate' dated 21.07.2022 was issued by the Executive Engineer, North Tank Division, Secunderabad after due inspection and upon the reports of the field authorities. As recorded in the order dated 28.05.2025 in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024, the certificate was preceded by the joint inspection of the Mandal Surveyor and the Assistant Engineer of the Irrigation Department conducted with the revenue authorities on 06.07.2022. The clarification/report addressed by the Tahsildar, Kukatpally dated 08.07.2022 to the Irrigation Department along with sketch is thus the formal communication of the outcome of a joint exercise in which the field functionaries participated. The circumstance that the communication bears the signature of the Executive Engineer alone does not detract from the joint inspection which preceded it. The office of the District Collector, Medchal Malkajgiri District, the revenue head of the District, issued a separate NOC

vide endorsement dated 26.04.2023 in proceedings bearing E1/TS-bPASS/2337/2022. The said NOCs. were acted upon by the municipal authorities for the grant of the building permission dated 07.12.2023. It stands judicially accepted in W.P. No. 22143 of 2024, where this Court, upon the counter affidavit of the Respondent No. 7 therein and the stand of the learned Special Government Pleader, held that the departments concerned had categorically stated that there is no water body or Nala and had given their respective No Objection Certificates. Official acts carry a presumption of regularity. It is presumed, until the contrary is shown, that official acts have been regularly performed, and the burden of displacing that presumption lies on the party who asserts the irregularity. The objection surfaced for the first time as an additional condition in the Terms of Reference dated 14.11.2024, more than two years after the certificate was issued, and after it had been acted upon and judicially noticed. A belated objection of this nature cannot denude the No Objection Certificate of its validity or efficacy. The requirement of revalidation, which finds no sanction in any statute or rule brought to the notice of this Court, is in substance an invitation to the State to reopen its own concluded acts and the concluded findings of this Court. Therefore, in view

of the above, there can be no challenge to the competence of the issuing officer or to the 'NOC' issued. It does not lie in the mouth of an instrumentality of the very State whose officer issued the certificate, whose Collectorate endorsed it, whose municipal corporation acted upon it and whose law officer defended it before this Court, to now disown it.

29. As to the third aspect, the premise that a stream is passing from the proposed site as per the KML file stands answered by the concluded record. The Order dated 28.05.2025 in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024 records, at Paragraph 13 extracted hereinabove, on the strength of the proceedings dated 21.07.2022 and 08.07.2022 of the State's own departments, that the subject lands are classified as patta lands, that a Nala passes adjacent to the said land towards its southern and eastern boundaries, that in view thereof a 2.0 meter buffer area of six guntas in extent is to be maintained, and that barring the said buffer area, no Full Tank Level or Nalas are there in the subject land. The position of the Nala and the buffer was thus known to, considered by, and accepted in the very proceedings culminating in 'No Objection Certificate' and in the judicial determination of this Court. A KML file, being satellite derived material, can stand no higher than the topo sheet of the Survey

of India, whose evidentiary worth qua the subject land this Court has already rejected, for the reasons recorded under Point No. 3, such material cannot override the village map, the statutory revenue record and the binding findings of this Court, and cannot be pressed into service to resurrect a concluded issue.

30. It is also significant that the written instructions of Respondent No. 4 themselves record that no adverse decision has been taken against the Petitioner. The proposal for Environmental Clearance made on 29.09.2025 was deferred by the State Level Expert Appraisal Committee at its meeting of 16.10.2025 solely because the proponent did not attend the meeting. The proposal was raised with Additional Details Sought on the portal for that reason alone and the delisting of the proposal on 28.01.2026 was an automatic act of the PARIVESH portal upon the proponent not responding. These are procedural incidents of the appraisal process and not an adjudication against the Petitioner. The only impediment attributable to Respondent No. 4, on its own showing, is the additional condition requiring revalidation of 'No Objection Certificate', and for the reasons recorded above, the said condition, insofar as it

requires revalidation of, or a fresh 'No Objection Certificate' on the grounds urged, cannot survive.

31. Point No. 4 is answered holding that insistence of Respondent No. 4 upon a fresh or revalidated 'No Objection Certificate' is unsustainable in law, and the objections founded upon being old, the signature of the Executive Engineer and the absence of the signatures of the other members of the joint inspection team, as also the premise founded upon the KML file, are rejected.

32. **POINT No. 5:**

The fifth point concerns the legality of the threatened disconnection of the electricity supply to the subject land. This Court records the fair stand of the learned Standing Counsel for TGSPDCL that Respondents 1 and 2 restored the electricity supply in compliance with the orders of this Court and have not since interfered with the subject land. That stand is consistent with the obligation of Respondents. 1 and 2, as a distribution licensee, to act only within the four corners of the Electricity Act, 2003.

33. Point No. 5 is answered by recording the stand of the standing counsel for Respondents 1 and 2 that they have not interfered with the subject land in any manner and are not

going to disconnect the power supply to the subject land. In view of the same, no further deliberation or direction is necessary in this regard.

34. In the result, the Writ Petition is allowed with the following declarations and directions:

(i) It is declared that subject land admeasuring Acs. 13.17 Guntas in Survey Nos. 1003 to 1006 of Kukatpally Village, Kukatpally Mandal, Medchal Malkajgiri District is private patta land of Petitioner being exempted and regularized under G.O.Ms. No. 469, Revenue Department, dated 26.03.2008. It is further declared that the subject land does not overlap with Khanamet Village including Survey No. 7 thereof, and that no water body, Shikam or Tank of any description, including any purported "Edula Kunta" exists on the subject land as these issues stand judicially concluded by the orders of this Court in Writ Petition No. 30773 of 2021 dated 22.02.2022 and Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024 dated 28.05.2025, both of which have attained finality, and cannot be reopened or re-agitated by the Respondents or by any other department, instrumentality or functionary of the State, for any purpose whatsoever, whether on the basis of the topo sheet of the Survey of India, satellite imagery of whatever vintage, any KML file or any other satellite derived material, or otherwise.

(ii) It is held that the State and all its functionaries, departments, instrumentalities and agencies are bound by the orders passed by this Court in Order dated 22.02.2022 in Writ Petition No. 30773 of 2021, order dated 28.05.2025 in Writ

Petition No. 22143 of 2024, order dated 03.09.2024 in I.A. No. 1 of 2024 in Writ Petition No. 24204 of 2024, and the orders dated 29.05.2026 and 04.06.2026 in the contempt cases referred to above and are duty bound to comply with the same without exception, and none of them is entitled to claim exemption therefrom or to raise afresh contentions concluded against the State.

(iii) It is declared that any restoration of the alleged water body namely "Edula Kunta", if it ever existed, is confined, by the express terms of Paragraph 23 of the order dated 28.05.2025 in Writ Petition No. 22143 of 2024, to Survey No. 7 of Khanamet Village or nearby Government land, and can never extend to the subject land.

(iv) The NGT is requested to pass necessary Orders in O.A. No. 74 of 2026 pending before it, giving due precedence, weightage and consideration to the findings of this Court in the present case, as well as to the Order dated 22.02.2022 in W.P. No. 30773 of 2021, the Order dated 28.05.2025 in W.P. No. 22143 of 2024, the Order dated 03.09.2024 in I.A. No. 1 of 2024 in W.P. No. 24204 of 2024, and the Orders dated 29.05.2026 and 04.06.2026 in the contempt cases referred to above, as mandated by the law declared by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***State of Andhra Pradesh v. Raghu Ramakrishna Raju Kanumuru (M.P.)***.

(v) In the light of the undertaking furnished by learned Standing Counsel for Respondents 1 and 2 to the effect that they have not interfered with the subject land in any manner whatsoever and further undertake not to disconnect the power supply to the subject land, this Court directs Respondents 1

and 2 to strictly abide by the said undertaking, without any deviation therefrom.

(vi) Respondent No. 3 shall stand bound by its statement, recorded in this judgment, that it has not instructed and shall not instruct Respondents 1 and 2 to disconnect the electricity supply to the subject land, and that it shall not interfere with the subject land otherwise than strictly in accordance with law and in conformity with the binding orders of this Court.

(vii) The stand of Respondent No. 4 that a fresh or revalidated 'No Objection Certificate' is required cannot be countenanced and is rejected, and the additional condition to the said effect incorporated in the Terms of Reference dated 14.11.2024 shall not be enforced against petitioner. In the event of petitioner pursuing its Application for the grant of Environmental Clearance, including by seeking restoration or resubmission of its proposal on the PARIVESH portal consequent upon the delisting dated 28.01.2026, Respondent No. 4 is directed to consider and process the Application of petitioner in accordance with law, without insisting upon revalidation of the existing 'No Objection Certificate' or upon any fresh or further 'No Objection Certificate' from the Irrigation Department, the Revenue Department or any other authority and by treating the existing 'No Objection Certificate' dated 21.07.2022 of the Irrigation Department and the 'No Objection Certificate' *vide* endorsement dated 26.04.2023 of the Revenue Department as valid and subsisting.

35. Consequently, the miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

NAGESH BHEEMAPAKA, J

31st July 2026

ksld