

\* **HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V. BHASKAR REDDY**

**+ WRIT PETITION No.29870 of 2023**

**% Date: 03.12.2024**

**Between:**

# M/s. Asian Tubes Private Limited  
Rep. by its authorised Signatory  
Mr. Shatrugan Agarwal. ... Petitioner

AND

\$ State of Telangana  
Revenue Department  
Rep. by its Principal Secretary,  
Telangana Secretariat at Hyderabad.  
and others. ... Respondents

**! Counsel for the Petitioner** : Mr.B. Nalin Kumar, learned  
Senior Counsel representing  
Ms. Pratusha Boppana.

**^ Counsel for Respondent Nos.1 to 5:** Government Pleader for Revenue

**^ Counsel for the Respondent No.6 :** Mr. Vedula Srinivas, learned  
Senior Counsel representing  
Mr.P. Vijay Kumar

**> HEAD NOTE:**

**? Cases referred**

1. AIR 2008 AP 15
2. (1994) 2 SCC 266
3. (2022) 12 SCC 815

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE C.V. BHASKAR REDDY**

**WRIT PETITION No.29870 of 2023**

**ORDER:**

This Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is filed by the petitioner, seeking following relief:

*“...to issue a Writ/Order or direction more specifically in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the 1<sup>st</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> Respondents in incorporating the name of the 6<sup>th</sup> Respondent in Dharani Portal/Revenue Records herein in respect of Land admeasuring Ac 02-00 guntas in Survey No.340/4/1 situated at Narsingi Village, Gandipet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District allegedly vide Transaction No. 2300787409 on 13.10.2023 and issuance of Pattadar Passbooks by deleting the name of the Petitioner, in grave violation of Order of Status Quo granted by this Hon'ble Court on 27.03.2014 in WP 9522 of 2014, in violation of Principles of Natural Justice, contrary to the provisions of the Telangana Pattadar Pass Books Act. 1971 and 2020 and also as being in consequent violation of Article 14 and Article 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently set aside the same by restoring the names of the Petitioner and cancelling the Pattadar Passbooks issued to 6<sup>th</sup> Respondent vide No. T05070060231 and may be pleased to pass such other Order/s as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper..”*

2. It is stated that the petitioner is the absolute owner and possessor of the land admeasuring Ac.2-00 gts in Sy.No.340/4/1 situated at Narsingi Village, Gandipet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, having purchased the same under registered sale deed dated 26.05.1998 bearing document No.1553/1998 from its lawful owners i.e, Mr. Mohan Gupta and Mr.Vinod Kumar Gupta. It is further stated that the petitioner is running an industry and is in possession of inventory i.e, steel bars, rounds etc., worth more than Crores of rupees and carrying on trading activity. It is also stated that

originally the subject land was part of Ac.5-00 gts of land purchased by one Begari Pentaiah in the auction conducted by the erstwhile State of Andhra Pradesh in the year 1960. Out of the said extent, said Begari Pentaiah sold an extent of Ac.4-34 gts to one P.Savitri Bai under registered sale deed dated 25.03.1965 bearing document No.413/1965. It is further stated that out of Ac.4-34 gts, the said P.Savitri Bai sold an extent of Ac.2-00 gts i.e, subject land to Smt.Sajni Bai and Smt. Pushpalatha under registered sale deed dated 25.08.1981 vide document No.5346/1981, who in turn sold the same to Mr. Mohan Gupta and Mr.Vinod Kumar Gupta (vendors of the petitioner) under registered sale deeds bearing document Nos.4561 and 4562 of 1987 dated 25.08.1987. It is also stated that the petitioner's vendors obtained permission from the-then Gram Panchayat vide Permission GPN No.32 of 1997 dated 02.06.1997 and constructed the compound wall. It is the case of the petitioner that since the date of purchase, it is in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the subject property and regularly paying the property tax and electricity charges to the concerned authorities.

3. It is further stated that the respondent No.3-Special Grade Deputy Collector and Revenue Divisional Officer, Rajendranagar Division ('SGDC & RDO, Rajendranagar Division'), without issuing any notice to the petitioner, issued Proceedings vide No.C/260/2014

dated 07.03.2014 by setting aside the mutation order in File No.B1/14967/1979 issued in favour of petitioner's predecessor and remitted the matter to the respondent No.4-Tahsildar, Gandipet Mandal, to pass orders afresh as per the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Rights in Land and Pattadar Passbooks Act, 1971 (for short "ROR Act, 1971"). It is the case of the petitioner that its vendor purchased the subject property under registered sale deed on 25.03.1965, which is much prior to the alleged sale deed dated 17.09.1980 of the respondent No.6 and therefore, the respondent No.6 has no right over the subject property. It is further stated that questioning the proceedings dated 07.03.2014, the petitioner filed W.P.No.9522 of 2014 on the file of this Court, wherein this Court vide order dated 27.03.2014 granted interim order as follows:

*"whatever the entries in the revenue record, existing as on today, to continue for a period of three(3) weeks".*

Subsequently, vide orders dated 24.02.2015, the said interim order was extended until further orders. It is the case of the petitioner that as on the date of passing said orders by this Court, the name of the petitioner is continuing in the revenue records. It is stated that questioning the very same proceedings dated 07.03.2014, third parties have filed another W.P.No.9876/2014 on the file of this Court and the same is pending for adjudication.

4. The grievance of the petitioner is that pending adjudication of W.P.Nos.9522/2014 and 9876/2014 and contrary to the *status quo* orders granted by this Court, the respondent No.6 in collusion with the revenue officials, created the documents and changed the entries in the revenue records. Therefore, the petitioner seeks a direction to respondents to restore the entries in the revenue records in terms of the *status quo* orders passed by this Court and cancel the entries made in favour of respondent No.6.

5. The respondent No.4 has filed counter affidavit stating that as per the revenue records i.e, Khasra Pahani, the nature of land in Sy.No.340 to an extent of Ac.54-19 gts has been classified as poramboke sarkari (Government land) and the said land was auctioned and divided into 11 sub-divisions with patta classification. As per the Pahani for the year 1975-76, the land in Sy.No.340/4 to an extent of Ac.5-00 gts was classified as patta land and stands in the name of Begari Pentaiah, as Pattedar. In the Pahani for the year 1985-86, the name of Patti Savitri was recorded as pattedar and the said entries continued upto the year 2005-06. It is further stated that in the Pahani for the year 2006-07, the land admeasuring Ac.2.00 gts in Sy.No.340/4 recorded in the name of writ petitioner i.e M/s Asian Tubes Private Ltd, represented by its Shatrugan Agarwal as Pattadar and possessor by rounding off the name of Smt.Patti

Savitri vide File No.D/970/2007 & B/253/2007 and the remaining extent of land admeasuring Ac.3-00 gts stood in the name of the original pattadar. It is also stated that the name of the petitioner continued in the Pahani for the year 2015-16 to an extent of Ac.2.00 gts and from 2017 onwards, the subject land admeasuring Ac.2-00 gts in Sy.No.340/4/1 is reflecting in the name of Sri Shatrugan Agarwal S/o.Lakshminarayana as Pattadar and possessor vide Patta No.266 of Narsingi Village and the same continued up to the year 2023. Thereafter, in the Dharani Portal, the said land is reflecting in the name of respondent No.6 vide Khata No.60248 of Narsingi Village. It is further stated that on verification of Dharani EC, it revealed that respondent No.6 applied for Patta passbooks in Court Case Module (TM-24), vide application No.RC2300006411 enclosing the orders in File No.C/260/2017, dated 07-03-2014 issued by the SGDC & RDO, Rajendranagar Division and the report of the Tahsildar, Gandipet Mandal and basing on the same, the name of respondent No.6 has been mutated. While stating the said facts, it is admitted by the respondent No.4 in the counter affidavit that by relying on the proceedings in File No.C/260/2014 dated 07.03.2014, the application of respondent No.6 was considered for alteration of the revenue records during the pendency of the Writ Petitions and in operation of the *status quo* orders passed by this Court.

6. On 19.10.2023, this Court passed the following order:

*“Issue notice to respondent No.6.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to take out personal notice to respondent No.6 by Registered Post with Acknowledgment Due and file proof of service.*

*Heard Sri B. Nalin Kumar, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner and learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue.*

*Mutation proceedings issued in favour of the petitioner were set aside by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Rajendranagar Division by order dated 07.03.2014 in proceeding No.C/260/2014. The same was questioned by the petitioner in W.P. No.9522 of 2014 and interim order dated 27.03.2003 was passed directing entries in revenue records which existed as on the date of order shall be maintained for a period of three (3) weeks. The said order was extended from time to time and the same is subsisting as on date.*

*In view of the same, there shall be interim direction to respondent No.6 not to interfere with the possession of the petitioner in respect of the land admeasuring Acs.2-00 guntas in Sy.No.340/4/1 situated at Narsingi Village, Gandipet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. Further, respondent No.4 is directed not to entertain any sale transactions in respect of the subject land until further orders.*

*Post on 16.11.2023.”*

7. After several adjournments, the respondent No.6 has filed counter affidavit denying the averments made in the writ affidavit. Paras 10 and 12 of the counter affidavit, reads as follows:

*“10. In reply to averments made in Para 12, it is a matter of record that the Writ Petitioner has obtained ex parte interim order Dt.27.03.2014 in W.P.9522 of 2014 stating that the revenue records existing as of the date shall be maintained. It is pertinent to state that though subsequently the interim orders were extended until further orders, this Hon'ble Court in the said order dt.24.02.2014, specifically observed that it was open for the Respondent to file counter and vacant petition and same shall be listed as and when the same is filed thereby contending that the same may be modified upon the filing and hearing of the vacate stay petition. That the Respondent herein aggrieved by the extension of such an order has duly filed the vacate petition on 24.04.2023. It is to submit that as rightly acknowledged by the Writ Petitioner, another Writ Petition 9876 of 2014 challenging the same proceedings as in W.P. 9522 of 2014 was filed. That post initial hearing of the Writ Petitions independently, both the matters were directed to be heard together along with W.P.No. 47590 of 2018. That in the said course, only W.P. 9876 of 2014 and W.P. 9522 of 2014 were listed on 09.06.2023 upon hearing the Writ Petitions. This Hon'ble Court was pleased to extend the interim orders for a limited period till 20.06.2023. That post the said hearing, the matters were heard at length on 31.10.2023, and no interim orders were extended thereafter and direction was issued by the Hon'ble Court calling for records in the said matters. Thereafter, the matters were adjourned at the request of both parties. At this juncture, in view of the non-extension of the interim orders, the answering Respondent approached the authorities for incorporation of the names in their favor. Whereupon, after serving due notices on concerned parties, the entries in Dharani were recorded in favor of Answering Respondent.*

*12. In reply to averments made in Para 14, it is denied and incorrect to state that Respondent No.4 has passed an order dt.27.05.2017 in Proceedings No.D/268/2019 without issuance of notice to the Petitioner and without compliance with the procedure under the Telangana Rights in Land and Pattadar Passbooks Act, 1971. It is pertinent to state that from the bare perusal of the said order, it is evident that in furtherance to the orders passed by the Special Grade Deputy Collector & Revenue Divisional officer in Proc. No.C/260/2015 directing the Tahsildar to dispose of the case by following the procedure contemplated under ROR*



*Act, 1971 based on the sale deeds in favor of the answering Respondent, the Tahsildar in compliance with the said orders has issued notices to the parties concerned intimating the date of enquiry. That despite the service of notices, as there was no appearance on behalf of the Respondents therein, they were set exparte, and orders dt.27.05.2017 came to be passed accepting the requisition of the Applicant/answering Respondent and directing that necessary changes have to be carried out in respect of Ac.15.00 gts in Sy.340/4, 340/5, 340/6, narsingi village, Gandipet Mandal. Further, it is incorrect to state that said orders are in violation or contrary to the orders in W.P.9522 of 2014 as the interim order is to the limited extent of "maintaining the revenue entries as on that date". That the orders of the Tahsildar came to be passed on merits, only in compliance with the directions issued by the Special Deputy Collector vide orders dt.07.03.2014. Further, the proceedings referred to in the said para i.e. of the year 2017, are caused prior to the orders of this Hon'ble Court dt.09.06.2023 i.e. during the subsistence of the interim order, which were only being continued till 20.06. 2023. Since the orders are not being continued post-2023, it is untenable to relate to the proceedings referred therein and thereof to plead that the alleged impugned proceedings were being made in violation of the interim order."*

8. The learned counsel for the petitioners filed a memo vide USR No.106362 dated 24.11.2024 enclosing the copy of the counter affidavit filed by the respondent No.3 herein-Revenue Divisional Officer, Rajendranagar Division (respondent No.2 in W.P.No.9522/2014), wherein in Para 11, it is stated as follows:

*"11. I submit that prima-facie, the sale deed executed by B. Pentaiah in favour of Respondent No.4 was without title and interest, since he had already sold land owned by him to P. Savitri, the application for mutation by Respondent No.4 was rejected. However, aggrieved by the said orders, Respondent No.4 preferred an appeal before the Special Grade Deputy Collector vide Proceedings No.C/260/2014, which is now under challenge in the present Writ Petition on the ground that "The Sale Deed*

*executed B.Pentaiah in favour of P.Savitri is a forged and fraudulent one”.*

*However, the said ground taken by Respondent No.4 though originally accepted by the Special Grade Deputy Collector, was later rejected by the Additional Collector in Proceedings No.D1/1383/2014 dated 14.08.2020 on the ground that the revenue authorities are not competent to declare sale deed as fraud, more so, after 40 years. Hence by virtue of the orders passed by the Additional Collector, the sale deeds and mutation orders in favour of P.Savitri, and the Writ Petitioner are valid, and the order passed by the Special Grade Deputy Collector have already been set aside. “*

9. Considered the submissions of Sri B.Nalin Kumar, learned Senior Counsel representing Ms. Pratusha Boppana, learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Government Pleader for Revenue appearing for the respondent Nos.1 to 5, Sri Vedula Srinivas, learned Senior Counsel representing Sri Vijay Kumar Panuganti, learned counsel for the respondent No.6 and perused the record.

10. It is stated that the petitioner has purchased the property to an extent of Ac.2-00 gts in Sy.No.340/4/1 situated at Narsingi Village, Gandipet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, under registered sale deed dated 26.05.1998 bearing document No.1553/1998 from its lawful owners i.e, Mr. Mohan Gupta and Mr.Vinod Kumar Gupta. It is further stated that vendors of the petitioner, purchased the said property under registered sale deeds bearing document Nos.4561 and 4562 of 1987 dated 25.08.1987, from Smt.Sajni Bai and Smt. Pushpalatha, who purchased the same from Smt. P. Savitri Bai,

under registered sale deed dated 25.08.1981 bearing document No.5346/1981. The said P.Savitri Bai, purchased the same from Begari Pentaiah under registered sale deed dated 25.03.1965 bearing document No.413/1965. It is the case of the petitioner that its vendors obtained permission from the Gram Panchayat and constructed compound wall and the petitioner is regularly paying the property tax and electricity charges to the concerned authorities. It is further case of the petitioner that the respondent No.6 suppressing these facts, in connivance with revenue authorities, obtained an order vide Proceedings No.C/260/2014 dated 07.03.2014 and got set aside the mutation order issued in favour of the petitioner's vendor (Smt. P.Savitri Bai) in File No.B1/14967/1979. Challenging the said proceedings, the petitioner herein filed W.P.No.9522/2014, wherein this Court granted interim order and subsequently, the same was extended until further orders. It is the specific case of the petitioner that the respondent No.3-SPGC and RDO, Rajendranagar Division, without issuing any notice to the persons whose names have been recorded in the revenue records and whose interest is being effected for alteration of the records, has issued Proceedings No.C/260/2014 dated 07.03.2014. It is seen from the record that in W.P.No.9522/2014 this Court granted interim order on 27.03.2014 directing to maintain *status quo* with regard to the entries made in the revenue records and thereafter, vide order dated 24.02.2015, the

said interim order was extended until further orders. Subsequently, the Additional Collector, Ranga Reddy District, vide Proceedings No.D1/1383/2014 dated 14.08.2020, had set aside the orders passed by the SGDC & RDO, Rajendranagar Division in File No.260/2014 dated 07.03.2014 in respect of the subject lands on the observation that revenue authorities are not competent to declare the sale deed as fraud more so after 40 years.

11. Interestingly, the respondent No.6 having contested the aforesaid proceedings dated 14.08.2020, intentionally suppressed the said facts before this Court. Thereafter, submitted application vide No.RC2300006411 enclosing the orders in File No.C/260/2014 dated 07.03.2014 issued by the respondent No.3 herein (which orders are subject matters of the *status quo* orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.9522/2014 and annulled by the Additional Collector, Ranga Reddy District, vide Proceedings No.D1/1383/2014 dated 14.08.2020) for mutation of entries in Dharani Portal. The revenue authorities i.e, District Collector, Ranga Reddy District, Revenue Divisional Officer, Rajendranagar Division and Tahsildar, Gandipet Mandal, being parties to the W.P.No.9522/2014 and pending adjudication of the said writ petition and contrary to the *status quo* orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.9522 of 2014 without issuing any notice to the writ petitioner herein or other

affected persons and contrary to the provisions of the ROR Act, 1971 and Rules made thereunder and law laid down by this Court in various judicial pronouncements, mutated the subject property in favour of the respondent No.6.

12. A careful reading of the counter affidavit filed by the respondent No.6 would reveal that except denying the right and entitlement of the petitioner, the respondent No.6 has not stated as to when and in what proceedings, the *status quo* orders granted by this Court in W.P.No.9522 of 2014 are modified or vacated. The respondent No.6 also not placed any document in support of his contention. Further, in the counter affidavit dated 21.03.2024 filed by the Revenue Divisional Officer, in W.P.No.9522 of 2014, it is stated that the orders granted by the SGDC & RDO, Rajendranagar Division in Proceedings No.C/260/2014 dated 07.03.2014 have been subsequently reviewed by the Additional Collector, Ranga Reddy District, and the case of the respondent No.6 was rejected vide Proceedings No.D1/1383/2014 dated 14.08.2020. In the teeth of the above proceedings, it does not lie in the mouth of the respondent No.6 that the revenue authorities have followed due procedure for altering the entries in the revenue records and incorporated the name of the respondent No.6 in the Dharani Portal and consequently, issued pattedar passbooks. Further, the respondent

No.6 in the counter affidavit filed by him, has not stated anything about the orders passed by the Additional Collector, Ranga Reddy District, in Proceedings No.D1/1383/2014 dated 14.08.2020, even though he is a party respondent to the said proceedings.

13. It is stated in the counter affidavit filed by the respondent No.4-Tahsildar, Gandipet Mandal, that the respondent No.6-Industrial Oil Purification Pvt. Ltd., represented by its authorised person i.e, Pajjuri Karunakar, submitted Dharani Application No.RC2300006411 and got updated the entries in the Dharani Portal as Pattadar vide Khata No.60248 of Narsingi village, Gandipet Mandal, Rangareddy District. To utter surprise, the very same respondent No.6-Industrial Oil Purification Pvt. Ltd, represented by the authorized Director Sri Srinivas Kandagatla, filed Writ Petition No.8097/2024 showing the Pajjuri Karunakar as respondent in the said writ petition and this fact was also not stated by the respondent No.6 in the counter affidavit filed in this writ petition, on 23.11.2024.

14. A Full Bench of this Court in ***Chinnam Pandurangam vs. Mandal Revenue Officer, Serilingampally Mandal***<sup>1</sup>, observed as under:

*“10. The issue deserves to be considered from another angle. If an application is made for amendment of the existing entries in the Record*

---

<sup>1</sup> AIR 2008 AP 15

*of Rights, the person whose name already exists in such record is entitled to contest the proposed amendment. He can do so only if a notice regarding the proposed amendment is given to him by the recording authority. An order passed against a person whose name already exist in the Record of Rights without giving him notice of the proposed amendment and effective opportunity of hearing is liable to be declared nullity on the ground of violation of the rule of audi alteram partem, which, as mentioned above, represent the most important facet of the rules of natural justice. It needs no emphasis that the rules of natural justice are applicable in all judicial and quasi-judicial proceedings. The rule of hearing is also applicable in purely administrative proceedings and actions where any public authority passes an order affecting the rights of any individual. The applicability of the rules of natural justice to purely administrative actions has been recognized by the Supreme Court in State of Orissa v. Dr. (Miss) Binapani Dei, AIR 1967 SC 1269 and has been reiterated in various judgments including those of A.K. Kraipak v. Union of India, AIR 1970 SC 150, Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, AIR 1978 SC 597, S.L. Kapoor v. Jagmohan, AIR 1981 SC 136, Swadeshi Cotton Mills v. Union of India, AIR 1981 SC 818 and Olga Tellis v. Bombay Municipal Corporation, AIR 1986 SC 180.*

**11.** *From the above discussion, it is clear that the requirement of issuing notice in writing to all persons whose names are entered in the Record of Rights and who are interested in or affected by the amendment is independent of the requirement of publication of notice in accordance with the second part of Section 5(3) read with Rules 19 and 5(2) of the Rules. The language of Form-VIII in which the notice is required to be published cannot control the interpretation of the substantive provision contained in Section 5(3), which, as mentioned above, casts a duty on the recording authority to issue notice in writing to all persons whose names are entered in the Record of Rights and who are interested in or affected by the proposed amendment.”*

15. It is settled law that when a Court issues a *status quo* order, it mandates that existing state of affairs be maintained until further directions are issued. Actions taken in violation of such orders are

considered illegal and without legal effect. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has consistently held that any act done in contravention of a *status quo* order is null and void.

16. In ***Satyabrata Biswas v. Kalyan Kumar Kisku***<sup>2</sup>, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that any act done in the teeth of the order of *status quo* is clearly illegal. All actions including the grant of sublease are clearly illegal. Admittedly, in the instant case, during the operation of the *status quo* orders, the respondent No.6 being party to the proceedings, maneuvered the records in a fraudulent manner and in active connivance with revenue officials corrected the entries in the revenue records incorporating his name vide Khata No.60248. It is settled law that any orders passed by the respondent-authorities during the operation of the *status quo* order are null and void and beneficiaries cannot claim any rights under such invalid orders and officers responsible for issuing such orders shall be subject to disciplinary proceedings for dereliction of duties and undermining the authority of this Court.

17. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***K.Jayaram and others vs. Bangalore Development Authority and others***<sup>3</sup>, held that it is imperative that party approaching the writ court must come with clean hands and put forward all facts before the Court without

---

<sup>2</sup> (1994) 2 SCC 266

<sup>3</sup> (2022) 12 SCC 815



concealing or suppressing anything. It was further observed that a litigant is bound to state all facts which are relevant to litigation and if he withholds some vital or relevant material in order to gain advantage over other side then he would be guilty of playing fraud with Court as well as with opposite parties which cannot be countenanced.

18. In the instant case, the respondents-authorities in violation of the *status quo* orders dated 27.03.2014 and 24.02.2015 passed by this Court in W.P.No.9522/2014 and without issuing any notice to the petitioner or to the persons who are interested/effected and contrary to the law laid down by the Full Bench of this Court in **Chinnam Pandurangam's** case (1 supra), mutated the subject property and issued Pattadar Passbook No.T05070060231 vide Khata No.60248 in favour of the respondent No.6. These things cannot take place without the support and connivance of the revenue authorities, who are also parties to the W.P.No.9522/2014. Therefore, the said action on the part of respondent Nos.2 to 6 not only amounts to undermining the authority of this Court but equally amounts to playing fraud. If such actions are allowed to be continued, the public will lose the confidence on the system and the Institution.

19. For the aforesaid reasons, this Writ Petition is allowed and ordered as follows:

i) The action of the Respondent Nos.1 to 4 in incorporating the name of the Respondent No.6 in Dharani Portal/Revenue Records in respect of land admeasuring Ac.2-00 guntas in Sy.No.340/4/1 situated at Narsingi Village, Gandipet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District vide Transaction No.2300787409 on 13.10.2023 and consequential issuance of Pattadar Passbook No.T05070060231 vide Khata No.60248 in favour of the respondent No.6, is declared as illegal, null and void.

ii) The respondent-authorities are directed to restore the entries in the revenue records existing in the name of the petitioner as on the date of passing of order dated 27.03.2014 by this Court in W.P.No.9522 of 2014 and issue pattadar passbooks as per the provisions of ROR Act, 2020, within a period of four (04) weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

iii) The respondent No.1 is directed to initiate suitable disciplinary action against the Officers, who are involved in aforesaid transaction of altering the revenue records and issuing the pattedar passbook, violating the orders dated 27.03.2014 and 24.02.2015 passed by this Court in W.P.No.9522 of 2014.

iv) The respondent No.6 herein being party to W.P.No.9522/2014, suppressed the facts referred above and played fraud to gain benefits over the subject property. Such action on the part of respondent No.6 is declared as *mala fide*, fraud, suppression of fact and sheer abuse of process of law. Therefore, the respondent No.6 is directed to pay costs of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs only) to the High Court Legal Services Committee, Hyderabad, within a period of four(04) weeks from today and a copy of the receipt for the said payment shall be filed in the Registry.

As a sequel, miscellaneous applications pending if any in this writ petition, shall stand closed.

---

**C.V. BHASKAR REDDY, J**

Date: 03.12.2024

**Note:** L.R Copy to be marked.

(b/o)  
scs