

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petitions for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 36261-36262/2026

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 30-09-2026 in IA No. 1/2026 in W.A. No.420/2016 30-09-2026 in IA No. 3/2026 in W.A. No.420/2016 passed by the High Court for The State of Telangana at Hyderabad]

TELANGANA INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
CORPORATION (TGIIC)

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

SHAHANA HYDER & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 314877/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Date : 14-10-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. C.S. Vaidyanathan, Sr. Adv.
Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sravan Kumar Karanam- 3132, AOR
Mr. Sriram Polali, Adv.
Mr. Kumar Abhishek, Adv.
Mr. Ronak Shankar Agarwal, Adv.
Ms. Radhika Sudheer, Adv.
Mr. Siddarth Seem, Adv.
Mr. P. Venkatraju, Adv.
Ms. Lakshita Yadav, Adv.
Ms. M. Harshini, Adv.

Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Devina Sehgal, AOR
Mr. Yatharth Kansal, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Yelamanchili Shiva Santosh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Rudrajit Ghosh, Adv.
Ms. Ritika Rao, Adv.
Mr. Prasun Nabiyal, Adv.
Mr. Tarun Gupta- 1917, AOR

Mr. M. A. Chinnasamy- 1150, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. Upon being mentioned by Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, learned senior counsel representing the State of Telangana, the SLP (Civil) No.36966/2026 is taken on Board. Both matters, i.e., SLP (Civil) Nos. 36261-36262/2026 and SLP (Civil) No.36966/2026, are being disposed of by this common order.

2. Having heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner(s) and learned counsel on behalf of the contesting respondent(s), who is on caveat, we deem it appropriate to dispose of these Special Leave Petitions with the following directions:

(a) The High Court is requested to decide the main case, i.e., Writ Appeal No.420/2016, where the question with respect to the vesting of the land in the State is involved, on a priority basis and preferably within two months;

(b) Since the Report of the survey of the subject land conducted pursuant to an interim order passed by the High Court is said to have been submitted before it, the High Court shall be at liberty to consider that report while deciding the main case and after inviting objections from both sides;

(c) However, the final decision in the appeal need not be delayed on account of the Survey Report, which has been obtained with a view to prevent unlawful encroachment.

3. The parties shall be at liberty to raise all contentions before the High Court, including those from previous rounds of litigation up to this Court.

4. We have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

5. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand closed.

(NITIN TALREJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI DILEEP KUMAR)
DY. REGISTRAR