

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA  
AT HYDERABAD**

FRIDAY, THE FOURTH DAY OF OCTOBER  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FOUR

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE ALOK ARADHE  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE J SREENIVAS RAO**

**WRIT APPEAL NO: 1056 OF 2024**

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent Against The Order Dated 19/08/2024 in Wp No.8305 Of 2024 on the file of the High Court.

**Between:**

1. Ghouse Mohiuddin Ali, S/o.Late Mohammed Mahboob Ali, Age.80 years, Occ.President MESCO, R/o.H.No.5-6-259/1, Aghapura, Hyderabad - 500 001.
2. Mohd. Samiullah Khan, S/o.Mohd. Waheedullah Khan Age.61 years, Occ.Vice-President MESCO, R/o.H.No.10-3-653/10/2, MIGH No.16/3 RT, Vijayanagar Colony, Hyderabad, Telangana.
3. Dr. Mohammed Shahid Ali, S/o. late Mohammed Mahmood Ali Age about 65 yrs Occ. Joint Secretary MESCO R/o. 22-2-736, Darul Shifa, Noorkhan Bazar, Hyderabad.
4. Khaleeq Uz Zaman Khan, S/o. Late Khadar Uz Zaman Khan Age.70 years, Occ. Member MESCO, Off at Unit No.10-3-79/A, Pillar No.3, Opp.Sarojini Eye Hospital, Humayan Nagar, Hyderabad, Telangana.
5. M/s. Muslim Educational Social Cultural Organization, MESCO Rep by its Hon. Secretary Dr. Mohammed Iftekharuddin, .

**...APPELLANTS**

**AND**

1. M/s. Muslim Educational Social Cultural Organization MESCO, Rep by its Hon. Secretary Dr. Mohammed Iftekharuddin,
2. Managing Committee, Muslim Education Social and Cultural Organisation (MESCO) Regd No. 758 / 1983, dt. 26031983 registered under Society Registration Act 1350 Fasli presently governed by APSRA 2001, Represented by its Hon Secretary Dr. Mohammed Iftekharuddin, All office at off at H.No.22-1-1037/1, Darushifa, Hyderabad.
3. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Secretary Home, Secretariat Buildings Tank Bund Road Hyderabad
4. The Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad Banjara Hills Hyderabad
5. The Dy Commissioner of Police, South Zone Basheerbagh Hyderabad

6. The Asst Commissioner of Police, Mirchowk Division Purani Haveli Hyderabad
7. The Inspector of Police, P S Mir Chowk Hyderabad

**...RESPONDENTS**

**IA NO: 1 OF 2024**

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased suspend the operation of the final Order passed by the Learned Single Judge in W.P.No. 8305 of 2024, dated 19/08/2024 pending disposal of the main Writ Appeal.

**Counsel for the Appellant : SRI VEDULA SRINIVAS, Sr.COUNSEL  
rep., SRI MIRZA SAFIULLA BAIG**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.1 : SRI B.MAYUR REDDY, Sr.COUNSEL rep.,  
SRI MIR OMER KHAN**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : Ms.MEENAKSHI ARORA, Sr. Counsel,  
rep., SRI K.CHAKRADHAR REDDY,**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.3to7 : SRI MAHESH RAJE, GP FOR HOME**

**The Court made the following: JUDGMENT**

**THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE ALOK ARADHE**  
**AND**  
**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE J.SREENIVAS RAO**

**WRIT APPEAL No.1056 OF 2024**

**JUDGMENT:** *(Per the Hon'ble the Chief Justice Alok Aradhe)*

Mr. Vedula Srinivas, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Mirza Safiulla Baig, learned counsel for the appellants.

Mr. B.Mayur Reddy, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Mir Omer Khan, learned counsel for the respondent No.1.

Ms. Meenakshi Arora, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. K.Chakradhar Reddy, learned counsel for the respondent No.2, appears through video conferencing.

Mr. Mahesh Raje, learned Government Pleader for Home appears for respondent Nos.3 to 7.

2. This intra court appeal is directed against the order dated 19.08.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.8305 of 2024 by which a writ petition preferred by respondent Nos.1 and 2 has been disposed of with the direction to the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Mir Chowk Division, Purani Haveli, Hyderabad as well as Inspector of

Police, P.S., Mir Chowk, Hyderabad to implement the judgment/order dated 03.01.2024 passed in C.M.A.Nos.119 and 120 of 2023 by the II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad as well as the order dated 12.01.2024 passed in W.P.No.1292 of 2024, orders dated 01.02.2023 and 15.02.2023 passed in O.S.No.1010 of 2022 and O.S.No.1007 of 2022 respectively by the VII Junior Civil Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad and order dated 30.12.2023 passed in Caveat No.1131 of 2023 by the Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad. In order to appreciate the grievance of the appellants, relevant facts need mention which are stated infra.

3. M/s.Muslim Education Social and Cultural Association (hereinafter referred to as 'the Society') is the Society registered under the Telangana Societies Registration Act, 2001. The aforesaid Society was founded for social and educational upliftment of community of Muslims. The Society is engaged in running educational institutions like schools, colleges, professional colleges and a diagnostic center and provides employment to nearly 500 people. One Dr. Mohammed Iftekharuddin on 19.05.2021 was appointed as Secretary for

Society. The aforesaid Dr. Mohammed Iftekharuddin on 28.12.2021 convened a meeting of the Managing Committee and replaced existing short term members namely Dr. Kausar Shaheen, Dr. M.Sahid Ali, Dr. Kaleem Ahmed Jaleeli, Dr. Nusrath Farees and Dr. Mohammed Moshin with five other persons for the period from 01.01.2022 to 31.12.2023. Thereafter, it appears that the aforesaid Dr. Mohammed Iftekharuddin was placed under suspension on 22.02.2022. In view of the dispute between the office bearers of the Society, the Registrar of Societies vide communication dated 02.02.2022 informed the rival factions to approach the competent Court of law for redressal of their grievance. The aforesaid letter of the Registrar dated 02.02.2022 was challenged by Dr. Mohammed Iftekharuddin in W.P.No.9143 of 2022 which was withdrawn.

4. The appellants as well as the other members filed a civil suit, namely O.S.No.35 of 2022 before the II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad against Dr. Mohammed Iftekharuddin and two others to declare the meeting dated 28.12.2001 and the resolutions passed therein dated

✓

—

28.12.2021 and 19.12.2021 and all subsequent meetings and resolutions passed by Dr. Mohammed Iftkharuddin and others as illegal and unauthorised and *ab initio* void as well as in violation of the bye-laws of the Society. The appellants and other members sought perpetual injunction against Dr. Mohammed Iftkharuddin.

5. One Syed Mohammed Hussain claiming himself to be the authorised signatory filed the suit for declaration, namely O.S.No.4545 of 2023 before the IX Junior Civil Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad, in the name of the Society. In the aforesaid suit, a declaration was sought to declare that the appellants and others are not the members/employees of the Society. The interlocutory application, namely I.A.No.1102 of 2023 was filed seeking temporary injunction. The trial Court granted *ad interim* injunction on 13.09.2023. The appellants and others filed interlocutory application, namely I.A.No.1102 of 2023 seeking dismissal of the suit *inter alia* on the ground that the trial Court lacks jurisdiction to try the suit as the dispute amongst the members of the Society has to be dealt with by the forum under Section 23 of the Telangana Societies

Registration Act, 2001. Thereupon, the trial Court in exercise of powers under Order VII Rule 10 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC), on 22.11.2023 returned the plaint for presentation before the proper forum and vacated the *ad interim* injunction.

6. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid order dated 22.11.2023 passed in O.S.No.4545 of 2023, the plaintiffs therein filed C.M.A.Nos.119 and 120 of 2023 before the II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad. In the aforesaid Civil Miscellaneous Appeals, interlocutory applications namely I.A.No.2016 of 2023 was filed in C.M.A.No.119 of 2023, whereas I.A.No.2014 of 2023 was filed in C.M.A.No.120 of 2023. The II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad by a common order dated 03.01.2024 granted the injunction. The aforesaid order is extracted below for the facility of reference:

“Further, I.A.Nos.2014 and 2016 of 2023 are allowed and the respondents/defendants are temporarily restrained from interfering with the decisions, resolutions, instructions, directions, working of staff, labour, Managing Committee, administration, business, management, accounts, funds, affairs in Head-office, branches, colleges,

schools, laboratories, equipment, coaching centres, diagnostic centres by any way disturbing, disrupting, occupying dispossessing the petitioner-Society from the schedule premises, till the disposal of C.M.A.No.119 of 2023 and C.M.A.No.120 of 2023. In the circumstances, no costs.”

7. Against the aforesaid order dated 03.01.2024, the appellants and others filed C.M.A.Nos.84 of 2024 and 79 of 2024 before this Court. The learned Single Judge by an order dated 14.06.2024 dismissed the aforesaid Civil Miscellaneous Appeals. However, the Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad was directed to dispose of Civil Miscellaneous Appeals, namely C.M.A.Nos.119 and 120 of 2023 as expeditiously as possible within a period of one month from the date of receipt of copy of the judgment.

8. Thereafter, the respondent Nos.1 and 2 filed an interlocutory application under Section 151 of CPC seeking police protection in C.M.A.Nos.119 and 120 of 2023 before the II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad. However, the aforesaid application was returned with an endorsement “*instead of seeking the relief of punishment of*



*violation, how can the petitioner seek police aid*". However, the respondent Nos.1 and 2 did not re-present the aforesaid interlocutory application, to file the writ petition, namely W.P.No.8305 of 2024 seeking a direction to the police to provide protection for implementation of interim order of injunction granted in C.M.A.Nos.119 of 120 of 2023. The learned Single Judge by an order dated 19.08.2024 allowed the writ petition and directed the respondent Nos.4 and 5, namely the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Mirchowk Division, Purani Haveli, Hyderabad and the Inspector of Police, P.S., Mir Chowk, Hyderabad respectively to implement the common order dated 03.01.2024. Hence, this appeal.

9. The learned Senior Counsel for the appellants submits that merely on the basis of affidavit, without holding any enquiry, the issue whether or not the order of injunction has been violated by a party cannot be decided in a summary proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. It is further submitted that the learned Single Judge has not conducted any enquiry before issuing the impugned order. It is further submitted that the learned Single Judge passed order

directing police protection or police aid to enforce the order of injunction, which is not an order contemplated under the law. The writ petitioners had the remedy either to file an application under Section 151 of CPC or under Order XXXIX Rule 2A of CPC. It is contended that the learned Single Judge ought to have appreciated that the extraordinary discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is not exercised if an efficacious alternative remedy is available. In support of his submissions, reliance has been placed on the decisions in **Satyanarayana Tiwari vs. Station House Officer, P.S., Santoshnagar, Hyderabad<sup>1</sup>**, **Polavarapu Nagamani vs. Parchuri Koteswara Rao<sup>2</sup>**, **Kabbakula Padma vs. State of Telangana<sup>3</sup>**, **Scaria Thomas and Company vs. Commissioner of Central Excise and ST, Vapi<sup>4</sup>** and **Mudraboina Odhelu vs. the State of Telangana<sup>5</sup>**.

10. On the other hand, learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.1 submitted that the orders passed by Division

---

<sup>1</sup> AIR 1982 AP 394

<sup>2</sup> 2010 (6) ALT 92 (DB)

<sup>3</sup> 2023 (1) ALT 765

<sup>4</sup> Manu/CS/0359/2023

<sup>5</sup> MANU/TL/0359/2023

Bench of this Court dated 17.10.2022 and 13.02.2023 in W.A.No.660 of 2022 (**Kabbakula Padma** (supra) and **Mudraboina Odhelu** (supra)) are the orders passed in the peculiar facts of the case. It is further submitted that this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has jurisdiction to provide for police assistance to ensure obedience of order of injunction. It is further submitted that since the properties of Society are situated in different Districts of the State and therefore, the remedy provided either under Section 151 or under Order XXXIX Rule 2A of CPC was not efficacious in the facts and circumstances of the case and therefore, the unofficial respondents had approached this Court by filing the writ petition seeking police protection. It is further submitted that sometime in January, 2024, the Presiding Officer of the trial Court was transferred and the post was vacant and therefore, instead of approaching the trial Court, the respondents approached this Court by filing the writ petition. It is further submitted that once an interim order is passed, the same is required to be complied with. It is further submitted that learned Single Judge has adverted to

---

various facts and circumstances due to which it has become necessary to issue a direction for police protection. Our attention has been invited to paragraphs 15, 19 to 21 of the order passed by the learned Single Judge. In support of her submissions, learned Senior Counsel has placed reliance on the decisions in **Rayapati Audemma vs. Pothineni Narasimham**<sup>6</sup>, **Satyanarayana Tiwari** (supra), **S.K.Sharma vs. Corporation of the City of Bangalore**<sup>7</sup>, **P.R.Muralidharan vs. Swami Dharmananda Theertha Padar**<sup>8</sup>, **Y.Chandraiah @ Y.Chandra Reddy vs. Commissioner of Police, Cyberabad, R.R.District, Hyderabad**<sup>9</sup>, **Kotak Mahindra Bank Limited vs. The Station House Officer, Madhapur P.S., Hyderabad**<sup>10</sup>, **A.Bharathi vs. State of Telangana**<sup>11</sup>, **Mohd. Khaja vs. The State of Telangana** (W.P.M.P.No.16619 of 2016 in W.P.No.13297 of 2016, dated 20.04.2016), **Boina Laxmi vs. State of Andhra Pradesh**<sup>12</sup>, **Satish Mutually Aided Co-op.**

---

<sup>6</sup> AIR 1971 AP 53

<sup>7</sup> 1986 SCC OnLine Kar 216 : ILR 1986 Kar 253

<sup>8</sup> (2006) 4 SCC 501 : 2006 SCC OnLine SC 296

<sup>9</sup> 2006 SCC OnLine AP 1148 : 2007 (1) ALD 730 :2007 (1) ALT 533

<sup>10</sup> 2015 SCC OnLine Hyd 285 : 2016 (1) ALD 696 (DB) : 2016 (2) ALT 164 (DB)

<sup>11</sup> 2016 SCC OnLine Hyd 490 : 2017 (1) ALT 149 : 2017 (1) ALD 503

<sup>12</sup> 2017 SCC OnLine Hyd 809 : 2018 (6) ALT 698 : 2019 (1) ALD 263

**Housing Society Limited vs. State of Telangana<sup>13</sup>, Kuruma Vanaja vs. State of Telangana<sup>14</sup>, Thati Narsimha Rao vs. State of Telangana<sup>15</sup>, Kabbakula Padma vs. State of Telangana (W.A.No.660 of 2022, dated 17.10.2022), Mudraboina Odhelu, Gadeela Srinivas Reddy vs. State of Telangana<sup>16</sup> and Juvvaji Ravinder vs. Jakkula Pushpaleela (C.R.P.No.3078 of 2023, dated 11.01.2024).**

11. Learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.2 submitted that the issue whether police aid can be granted to enforce an order of injunction is a question which has to be decided on case to case basis and if an aspect of public injury is involved, this Court would issue a direction to police to enforce the order of injunction. It is further submitted that the order passed by the learned Single Judge does not suffer from any infirmity warranting interference of this court in this intra court appeal.

---

<sup>13</sup> 2019 SCC OnLine TS 2783

<sup>14</sup> 2021 SCC OnLine TS 607

<sup>15</sup> 2022 SCC OnLine TS 2384

<sup>16</sup> 2023 SCC OnLine TS 4093

12. We have considered the rival submissions and have perused the record. A Division Bench of the Andhra Pradesh High Court in **Satyanarayana Tiwari** (supra) by placing reliance on the decision of the Supreme Court in **Satyanarayan vs. Mallikarjun**<sup>17</sup>, dealt with the issue whether in exercise of powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, an order directing police protection for implementation of order of injunction can be passed. It was held as under:

“8. In *Satyanarayan v. Mallikarjun* (AIR 1960 S.C. 137) the Supreme Court reiterated this principle and went a step further that for doing justice between the parties the High Court has absolute jurisdiction to issue such directions and orders as it may deem fit to do justice between the parties and enforce the law of the land. The only limitations on the wide powers conferred on the High Court and exercisable by it in the matter of issuing writs are (1) that the power is to be exercised throughout the territories in relation to which it exercises jurisdiction and (2) that the person or authority to whom the writ is issued, is within the territories over which the respective High Courts exercise jurisdiction. None of these limitations come in the way of the High Court issuing appropriate directions to further secure the right determined and recognised by the Civil Court. The power which a Civil Court has under Sec, 151 C.P.C., the High Court has in much larger measure under Art. 226 of the Constitution. We have, therefore, no hesitation in concluding, that this court

---

<sup>17</sup> AIR 1960 SC 137

has ample jurisdiction to issue a writ or direction to all the authorities including the police within the State to enforce the orders of the civil Court as confirmed by the High Court in a Civil Revision Petition and maintain the Rule of law. The police authorities are therefore bound to give all assistance to the appellant to enforce and see that the orders of this Court as confirmed in CR P No. 3258/81 are implemented and any enquiry or report of any other authority, revenue or police, cannot be put as an excuse for not rendering the required help to the appellant to maintain his possession. This order will be subject only to the final orders of the Civil Court in OS. 3770 of 80."

13. The Supreme Court in **P.R.Muralidharan** (supra), while dealing with scope of a writ for 'police protection', in paragraph 19 held as under:

"19. A writ for "police protection" so-called, has only a limited scope, as, when the court is approached for protection of rights declared by a decree or by an order passed by a civil court. It cannot be extended to cases where rights have not been determined either finally by the civil court or, at least at an interlocutory stage in an unambiguous manner, and then too in furtherance of the decree or order."

14. However, the aforesaid decision of Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh in **Satyanarayana Tiwari** (supra) as well as the decision of the Supreme Court in

**P.R.Muralidharan** (supra), was not brought to the notice of Division Bench which decided W.A.Nos.660 of 2022 and 187 of 2023. From perusal of the orders passed by the aforesaid Division Bench decisions, it is evident that the ratio of the aforesaid decisions is that the writ petitions seeking direction to provide police protection in furtherance of order of injunction should not ordinarily be entertained unless element of injury to public or infraction of statute is made out. The Court while exercising the writ jurisdiction has to ascertain whether or not it is entering into the arena of private dispute. Even in the aforesaid orders passed in W.A.Nos.660 of 2022 and 187 of 2023, the Division Benches held that an order for grant of police protection to implement the order of injunction can be issued if there is an element of injury to public or infraction of the statute is made out. Thus, the aforesaid decisions cannot be said to be an authority for the proposition that this Court should not order police protection to implement the order of injunction while exercising power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.



15. The police authorities are under a legal duty to enforce public order and a citizen is entitled to seek writs for police protection in an appropriate case notwithstanding the remedy available under Section 151 of CPC and Order XXXIX Rule 2A of CPC. However, we may add that the aforesaid power has to be exercised cautiously and rarely in an appropriate case to meet the ends of justice and to uphold the rule of law. Needless to state that the Court while exercising the aforesaid power, has to satisfy itself that a *prima facie* case for violation of order of injunction is also made out.

16. In the backdrop of the aforesaid legal position, we may advert to the facts of the case in hand to find out whether, in the instant case, the learned Single Judge was justified in exercising the power to order police protection.

17. The Society is registered under the Telangana Societies Registration Act, 2001. On 02.05.2022, Registrar of Societies took the details of office bearers on record. One Kauser Shaheen on 17.05.2022 obtained certificate of the office bearers of the Managing Committee from the Office of the

Registrar of Societies. Thereafter, the aforesaid Kauser Shaheen filed a writ petition, namely W.P.No.24046 of 2022, in which order dated 02.05.2022 of the Registrar of Societies was under challenge. However, the aforesaid writ petition was subsequently withdrawn. Thereafter the aforesaid Kauser Shaheen filed O.P.No.35 of 2022 before the II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad challenging the notice dated 24.12.2021. First Information Report was lodged against the appellants and others, namely F.I.R.No.512 of 2022 on 30.12.2022 for offences under Sections 403, 406, 420, 468, 471 read with Section 34 of IPC.

18. In O.S.No.1010 of 2022, an order of injunction was granted in I.A.No.666 of 2022, dated 01.02.2023 in favour of the Managing committee of the Society. The appellants filed an application, namely I.A.No.482 of 2022 seeking their impleadment in the aforesaid civil suit, which was dismissed on 11.01.2024. On 15.02.2023, an order of injunction was granted in I.A.No.665 of 2022 in O.S.No.1007 of 2022 in favour of the Society. The appellants filed application for impleadment in the aforesaid civil suit as well which was

dismissed on 11.01.2024. Thereafter, the Society filed O.S.No.4545 of 2023 seeking the relief of declaration and injunction. In the aforesaid civil suit, the trial Court on 13.09.2023 granted an interim order of injunction. The appellants thereupon filed an interlocutory application seeking dismissal of the suit *inter alia* on the ground that the trial Court lacks jurisdiction to try the suit as the dispute between the members of the Society has to be tried in a forum under Section 23 of the Telangana Societies Registration Act, 2001. The trial Court thereupon by an order dated 22.11.2023 returned the plaint.

19. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid order, the Society filed C.M.A.Nos.119 and 120 of 2023 before the II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad. In the aforesaid Civil Miscellaneous Appeals, interlocutory applications, namely I.A.No.2016 of 2023 was filed in C.M.A.No.119 of 2023, whereas I.A.No.2014 of 2023 was filed in C.M.A.No.120 of 2023. The II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad by a common order on 03.01.2024 granted interim order of injunction. Against the aforesaid order dated

03.01.2024, the appellants and others filed C.M.A.Nos.84 and 79 of 2024. The learned Single Judge by an order dated 14.06.2024 dismissed the aforesaid Civil Miscellaneous Appeals. However, the Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad was directed to dispose of C.M.A.Nos.119 and 120 of 2023 as expeditiously as possible within a period of one month from the date of receipt of the judgment. From the aforesaid narration of facts, it is evident that the dispute between the parties has a chequered history.

20. It is pertinent to note that the property of the Society is situated in more than one district. The Society would have been required to initiate several proceedings in different districts. The Society runs schools, colleges, professional colleges, hospital and a diagnostic center. Therefore, the order of injunction has to be obeyed by the parties by which they are bound. Therefore, in case an order of injunction is flouted, the public, who visit the schools, colleges, hospital and diagnostic centre run by the Society, may suffer. The learned Single Judge has recorded cogent reasons in paragraphs 15 and 19 to 21 for granting police aid to enforce the order of injunction. it

is not in dispute that the appellants are bound by the order of injunction.

21. However, the learned Single Judge has issued a direction to the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Mir Chowk Division, Purani Haveli, Hyderabad as well as Inspector of Police, P.S., Mir Chowk, Hyderabad to implement judgment/orders in I.A.No.2016 of 2023 in C.M.A.No.119 of 2023 and I.A.No.2014 of 2023 in C.M.A.No.120 of 2023, dated 03.01.2024 on the file of II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad, W.P.No.1292 of 2024 dated 12.01.2024, I.A.No.666 of 2022 in O.S.No.1010 of 2022 dated 01.02.2023, I.A.No.665 of 2022 in O.S.No.1007 of 2022 dated 15.02.2023 on the file of VII Junior Civil Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad and Caveat No.1131 of 2023 dated 30.12.2023 passed by the Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad.

22. In our opinion, the aforesaid order needs to be modified to the extent that as and when police aid is required to the schools, colleges, hospital and diagnostic centre run by the Society, the same shall be provided by the Assistant

Commissioner of Police, Mir Chowk Division, Purani Haveli, Hyderabad as well as Inspector of Police, P.S., Mir Chowk, Hyderabad to implement the orders of injunction and see that there is no violation of the orders of injunction.

23. To the aforesaid extent, the order passed by the learned Single Judge is modified.

24. Accordingly, the writ appeal is disposed of. No costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, pending if any, shall stand closed.

**SD/-T. KRISHNA KUMAR  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR**

**//TRUE COPY//**


**SECTION OFFICER**

To,

1. The Hon. Secretary Dr. Mohammed Iftekharuddin M/s. Muslim Educational Social Cultural Organization MESCO,
2. The Hon Secretary, Managing Committee, Muslim Education Social and Cultural Organisation (MESCO) Regd No. 758 / 1983, dt. 26031983 registered under Society Registration Act 1350 Fasli presently governed by APSRA 2001, Dr. Mohammed Iftekharuddin, All office at off at H.No.22-1-1037/1, Darushifa, Hyderabad.
3. The Secretary Home, Secretariat Buildings Tank Bund Road State of Telangana, Hyderabad
4. The Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad Banjara Hills Hyderabad
5. The Dy Commissioner of Police, South Zone Basheerbagh Hyderabad
6. The Asst Commissioner of Police, Mirchowk Division Purani Haveli Hyderabad
7. The Inspector of Police, P S Mir Chowk Hyderabad
8. One CC to SRI MIRZA SAFIULLA BAIG, Advocate. [OPUC]
9. One CC to SRI MIR OMER KHAN, Advocate. [OPUC]
10. One CC to SRI K.CHAKRADHAR REDDY, Advocate. [OPUC]
11. Two CCs to GP FOR HOME, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad. [OUT]
12. Two CD Copies.

BSK

BS



**HIGH COURT**

**DATED:04/10/2024**

**JUDGMENT**

**WA.No.1056 of 2024**



**DISPOSING OF THE WRIT APPEAL  
WITHOUT COSTS**

15  
14/10/24  
BWS