IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA, HYDERABAD

****

WRIT PETITION (PIL) NO.21 OF 2026

(CNR NO. HBHC010388212026)

DATE: 30.10.2026

Between:

Bandi Narayana and others

…. Petitioners

and

The State ofTelangana, rep.by its Chief Secretary,
Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

…. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED : 30.10.2026

HON'BNLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUDDALA CHALAPATHI RAO

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the Judgments ? : Yes

2. Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reporters/Journals : Yes

3. Whether Their Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment ? : Yes

_____

SUDDALA CHALAPATHI RAO, J

*** HON'BNLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY**
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUDDALA CHALAPATHI RAO

+ WRIT PETITION (PIL) NO.21 OF 2026

% 30.10.2026

Between:

Bandi Narayana and others

…. Petitioners

and
and

$ The State ofTelangana, rep.by its Chief Secretary,
Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

…. Respondents

!Counsel for the petitioners : Mr. P. Varan Reddy

Counsel for the Respondent No.5: Mr. Koppula Gopal

<Gist :

>Head Note:

? Cases referred:

1. (2010) 3 SCC 402;
2. Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6567 of 2023, dated 05.05.2023 of High Court of Judicature at Patna

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUDDALA CHALAPATHI RAO

WRIT PETITION (PIL) NO.21 OF 2026
(CNR NO. HBHC010388212026)

DATE: 30.10.2026

Between:

Bandi Narayana and others

…. Petitioners

and

The State ofTelangana, rep.by its Chief Secretary,
Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

…. Respondents

ORDER: *(per Hon'ble Sri Justice Suddala Chalapathi Rao)*

Heard Mr. P.Varun Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Koppula Gopal, learned counsel for the respondent No.5.

2. The present writ petition has been filed, by way of Public Interest Litigation by the petitioners, who are Advocates, seeking to grant the following relief:

> "…to issue an appropriate Writ Order or Direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondent Nos.1 to 4 in proposing and proceeding with the establishment of the New Vikarabad

> District Court Complex at the proposed site situated at Billadakla/Mekalagandi/Poramboke land, despite the same having been found unsuitable by the erstwhile Hon'ble Principal District and Sessions Judges, as arbitrary, illegal and contrary to public interest and consequently, to direct the respondents to reject the said proposed site and to consider and allot a suitable alternative site, namely, the Horticulture Centre Yennepally in Sy.Nos.290, 302, 304, 305 and 306, as recommended by the erstwhile Hon'ble Principal District and Sessions Judges or in the alternative, the land situated at Shivareddypet in Sy.No.43, admeasuring Acs.10.14 guntas for the establishment of the proposed 10 plus 2 New District Court Complex at Vikarabad, after conducting a proper feasibility and suitability assessment in the larger interest of litigants, judicial officers, court staff, advocates and the general public and pass …."

3. The petitioners claim to be practicing Advocates in and around vicinity of newly formed Vikarabad District. It is stated that erstwhile Government established new Judicial Districts, wherein Vikarabad was carved out and accordingly, proposals were made for establishment of a new District Collectorate Complex, and the District Court Complex, and accordingly, sites were identified for the said purpose, and in the said process, the land situated at Biladakla/Mekalagandi/Poramboke at Alampally,

Vikarabad district, was chosen for construction of the new District Court Complex.

4. It is contended that said land, which was rejected as not suitable for construction of a new District Collectorate along with construction of the Jail Complex, owing to the disadvantages, was accepted and proposed for construction of a new District Court Complex. It is contended that the then District Collector and the Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, who are the competent authorities, without examining its suitability and without any proper enquiry recommended, for construction of a new District Court Complex. It is specifically contended that if the said District Court Complex is constructed, it will cause great inconvenience to all the litigants, Advocates, and has the impact on the public at large. The respondent-State sanctioned relevant budget, and the foundation stone was proposed to be held on 11.04.2026, however, the same was kept in abeyance owing to its serious disadvantages.

5. The petitioners tried to impress upon this Court by drawing attention to the letter, dated 24.12.2025 addressed by the then

Principal District Judge, Vikarabad, to the District Collector, Vikarabad District, where learned Principal District Judge expressed his opinion towards its non-suitability to construct a new District Court Complex and residential quarters for Judicial Officers, as the said land comprises rocky soil, deep and totally uneven, and there are no trees or any water facilities. Further, it is also contended that the Members of the Advocates' Bar Association, Vikarabad, have submitted a representation, dated 18.11.2024 to this Court to propose alternate land, preferably the Horticulture land in Sy.Nos.296, 302, 303, 304, 305 and 306, situated at Yennepally, Vikarabad Municipality or any other suitable site for construction of the District Court Complex, for the convenience of all stakeholders. If the District Court Complex is constructed on the land proposed would adversely affect the larger public interest along with the stakeholders. Thus, it is contended that as the matter involves larger public interest, the petitioners, being practicing Advocates and persons interested in the matter, have constrained to approach this Court by the instant Public Interest Litigation, for interference into the matter.

6. Evidently, the present writ petition has been filed by the petitioners contending to be practicing Advocates in and around Vikarabad District. The grievance of the petitioners is that land identified and proposed for construction of the District Court Complex is not suitable since it is not in a proper shape, meeting the standards for proper functioning of the Court proceedings and the convenience of all stakeholders, and that it is detrimental to the proper establishment and function of the proposed Court building. It is an undisputed fact that the establishment of the new District Courts, along with the suitable infrastructure is the sovereign function of the respondent-State in consultation with this Court. Further, whether the said place is suitable for construction of the District Court Complex, as well as, providing the necessary infrastructure and all amenities to all the stakeholders will be in the domain of the respondent–State, and it is the for the State to take the policy decisions to construct the District Courts by providing all the necessary infrastructure and amenities in due consultation with this Court, on the administrative side.

7. Evidently, nothing concrete is placed by the writ petitioners so as to assert that the place which was chosen and allotted by the

respondent-State for construction of the District Court, does not meet the requirement. Once a writ petition is filed in nature in the larger public interest, the petitioners have to primarily file concrete material to support their contentions, and cannot mechanically file such writ petitions. If such type of writ petitions are entertained, we are afraid that every policy decision taken by the State with regard to the establishment and construction of District Court Complexes, will be flooded before this Court. Such matters which seriously affect and prolong the process of establishments and construction of Court Complex should always be discouraged.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Uttaranchal v. Balwant Singh Chaufal and others**[1], has laid some conditions so as to meet the parameters for filing of the Public Interest Litigations, wherein around eight parameters were fixed in the said judgment.

9. For better understanding of the case, the relevant parameters which are governing the instant writ petition filed by way of public interest litigation are enlightened and extracted hereunder:

[1] (2010) 3 SCC 402

> " (1). The Courts must encourage genuine and bona fide PIL and effectively discourage and curb PIL filed for extraneous considerations.
>
> (2) and (3) xxxxxx
>
> (4) The Courts should be prima facie satisfied regarding the correctness of contents of the petition before entertaining a PIL.
>
> (5) The Courts should be fully satisfied that substantial public interest is involved before entertaining the petition.
>
> (6) xxxx
>
> (7) The Courts before entertaining PIL should ensure that PIL is aimed at redressal of genuine public harm or public injury. The Court should also ensure that there is no personal gain, private motive or oblique motive behind filing public interest litigation.
>
> (8) xxxx."

10. In the light of the parameters framed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State of Uttaranchal** (supra), the petitioners, who have themselves stated to be advocates, though pleaded that the place proposed is not suitable for construction of District Court Complex, have not concretely produced any material before this Court, so as to interfere with the sovereign function of the respondent-State.

11. In **Rajesh Kumar Singh v. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna (Civil Writ Jurisdiction**

Case No.6567 of 2023, dated 05.05.2023), the Hon'ble Division Bench of High Court of Judicature at Patna held as follows:

> "……. We are afraid that there is no public interest discernible from the aforesaid prayers made which is almost in the nature of seeking information for which there are adequate remedies available under the Right to Information Act, 2005.
>
> In any event, we are not convinced there could be any such claim made in public interest, especially when the High Court is in seisin of the infrastructure needs of the District Courts. The land for construction of court complexes are first identified by the local inspection conducted by the District Judge and the District Magistrate upon which a proposal is sent either to the Law Department or to the High Court. The Infrastructure Committee of Judges appointed in the High Court then considers the proposal and then with appropriate consultation with the Law Department and the Building Construction Department approves the identification of the plot and building construction for the purpose of establishment of Courts.
>
> We are of the opinion that the writ petition lacks bona fide, and the same has to be dismissed in limine."

12. It is pertinent to note that due to advent of technology, it is apposite to observe modern techniques in engineering have emerged, the appropriate bridges are even laid through connecting other parts of the sea through the sea and various skyscrapers are even being built. More so, even assuming the proposed site to be

not in a good shape, once the respondent-State allots the said land for construction of establishment of District Court Complexes, it is for the State to make the necessary budgetary allocations for undertaking the construction and providing all requisite infrastructure facilities along with all amenities. If requests of such nature are entertained, it would impede the establishments of Courts, around 33 new Judicial Districts have been formed in the State of Telangana and several District Court complexes now have been sanctioned by the Government, and the construction works of the District Court complexes have been commenced and some of them are at the verge of completion of construction work. Further, we can understand if the petitioners apprehend that the State does not provide infrastructural facilities along with all amenities to all stakeholders not being done, which would be a ground for interference. However, we made it clear that respondent-State shall ensure provision of all necessary infrastructure, all the amenities for all the stakeholders including women, physically challenged, senior citizens, etc., and also better connectivity to the Court Complex for all the stakeholders and public at large. The petitioners vehemently take objection of the

construction due to its non-suitability. Thus, such writ petitions have to be discouraged. In the light of the above, the writ petition does not merit consideration and no discernible public interest has been demonstrated, warranting interference by this Bench.

13. In view of the foregoing discussion, the Writ Petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.

There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous application, if any, pending shall stand closed.

P.SAM KOSHY, ACJ

SUDDALA CHALAPATHI RAO,J

Date: 30.10.2026
kkm

THE HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUDDALA CHALAPATHI RAO

WRIT PETITION (PIL)NO.21 OF 2026

DATE: 30.10.2026

Kkm