

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGSPetition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 16178/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 23-04-2025 in CRP No. 1170/2020 passed by the High Court for The State of Telangana at Hyderabad]

GURU NANAK EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

A VENKATA NARSIMHA RAJU

Respondent(s)

[THE MATTER WOULD BE TAKEN UP AFTER COMPLETION OF THE HEARING IN ALL THE OTHER MATTERS]

IA No. 140504/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 140503/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 140501/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA No. 15748/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA No. 15747/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

WITH

SLP(C) No. 16093/2025 (XII-A)

FOR ADMISSION

IA No. 139898/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 139897/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 22-05-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. VINOD CHANDRAN

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Siddharta Dave, Sr. Adv.
Mr. C S Vaidyanathan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Md. Sadath Hussain, AOR
Mr. Md Moin Ahmed Quadri, Adv.
Mr. Md Irshad Ahmed, Adv.
Mr. Ms Nikita Kumari, Adv.
Mr. Yusuf Tariq, Adv.
Ms. Leela Padmavathi, Adv.
Ms. Nikita Kumari, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sughosh Subramanyam, Adv.
Mr. Vipin Nair, AOR
Ms. Sanskruti Samal, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Narendranath, Adv.
Mr. P B Sashaankh, Adv.
Mr. Haresh Nair, Adv.
Mr. Parth Agrawal, Adv.

Mr. C.Aryama Sundaram, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Navin Kumar Pahwa, Sr. Adv.
Mr. S.udaya Kumar Sagar, Adv.
Ms. Bina Madhavan, Adv.
Mr. Balaji Verma, Adv.
Mr. Shubhangi Arora, Adv.
M/S. Lawyer S Knit & Co, AOR

Mr. Narender Kumar Verma, AOR

Mr. E. Ajay Reddy, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Nidesh Gupta, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Piyush Dwivedi, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel, the Court made the following
O R D E R

Having heard the learned senior counsel appearing for the parties at length, we find no good ground and reason to interfere with the impugned judgment passed by the High Court.

The special leave petitions are, accordingly, dismissed.

We may note that the High Court allowed the Civil Revision Petition and the specific prayer made in the said Civil Revision Petition was to reject the plaint in the suit and, therefore, the suit would stand rejected as on date, though this has not been spelt out in so many words in the impugned judgment.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(IRAMNAZ)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(PREETI SAXENA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)