

PROCEEDINGS OF THE LAND REFORMS TRIBUNAL-CUM-SPECIAL
GRADE DEPUTY COLLECTOR AND REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
RANGA REDDY EAST DIVISION, RAGA REDDY DISTRICT.

PRESENT: Sri T. Manikyala Rao, B.Com.

C.C. No. E / 5033 / 06,
C.C. No. E / 2271 / 06
C.C. No. E / 621 / 07

Dated: 8-8-2007

Declarant: M/s Margadarshi Clit Fund Ltd.
H.No. 5-10-195 Fathemidan Road, Hyderabad-501 004.

ORDER:-

Under Section 8(2) of A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973, a notice dated 12th December, 2006 in Form III under Rule 3(4) of A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Rules, 1974 was issued to the declarant requiring it to file a declaration on or before 28th December, 2006, a declaration in Form No. I of the Rules declared full and correct particulars of the land held by the Company.

Pursuant to the said notice issued under Section 8(2) of the Act, the declarant filed the declaration in Form. I on 27th December, 2006. The Declarant has declared land to an extent of Ac 22-05 cents in Sy.Nos. 63, 64, 65, 67 to 79 and 278/79 of Polkampally village of Ibrahimpatan Mandal and Sy.No. 491 of Anajpur village of Hayathnagar Mandal Ranga Reddy District.

Under Rule 4 of the A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Rules, 1974, a public notice in Form IV containing the particulars of the land held by the declarant as stated by the declarant was published by affixing a copy thereof, on the notice boards of the Office of this Tribunal, Taluq office and the Office of Gram Panchayat, in whose jurisdiction the lands declared are situated. The fact of the receipt of the declaration and its availability for the public inspection in the Office of the Tribunal was announced by beat of Tom-Tom in the villages in which the lands are situated.

The declaration was referred to the Tahsildar/Mandal Revenue Officer under Rule 4(5) of the Rules, with in whose jurisdiction, the lands are situated for local inspection and verification. After due verification and inspection, the Tahsildar/Mandal Revenue Officers had submitted the verification reports. As per the said verification reports the declarant is in possession of the following lands.

Sl. No.	Name of the village and Mandal	Sy.No.	Extent in Ac.Cents	Category	Standard Holding
1	Palamakula village, Shamshabad Mandal	22,23,24,	24-10	J(60)	0.4016
		23,24	2-93	J(60)	0.0497
		23/A	1-83	J(60)	0.0305
		33,34,36	22-95	J(60)	0.3825
		38	4-65	J(60)	0.0775
		52	14-93	J(60)	0.2488

		32	15-48	J(60)	0.2580
		35	10-90	J(60)	0.1817
		37	13-13	J(60)	0.2188
2.	Madanpally village, Shamshabad Mandal	104	2-50	J(60)	0.0416
	Total		113-45		1.8907
3.	Anajpur village, Hayathnagar Mandal	491	1-85	J(60)	0.0308
	Total		1-85		0.0308
4.		63	0-05	E(25)	0.0002
		64	0-48	E(18)	0.0266
		65	1-00	E(25)	0.0370
		67	2-23	E(18)	0.0239
		68	0-18	J(60)	0.0030
		69	1-85	E(18)	0.1038
		70	1-03	E(25)	0.0411
		71	0-90	F(27)	0.0333
		72	1-78	F(18)	0.0989
		73	1-68	E(18)	0.0933
		74	1-85	E(18)	0.1028
		75	1-85	F(27)	0.0685
		76	1-98	F(27)	0.0733
		77	1-45	F(27)	0.0537
		78	1-38	F(27)	0.0511
		79	2-55	E(25)	0.1020
	Total		22-24		0.9125
	Grand Total		137-54		2.8340

In response to the notice published in Form IV, one Sri. Balaji Verma filed an objection petition. The said objection petition was rejected by this Tribunal as the said objector has no interest in the lands declared by the declarant.

A copy of the verification report was furnished to the declarant and to the Authorized Officer.

On behalf of the declarant objections were filed. The Authorized Officer filed the reply to the said objections. The objections of the declarant are:

- (i) that the declarant did not own or possess any agricultural land as on the date of commencement of A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973,
- (ii) the declarant did not acquire or hold any agricultural land in excess of the ceiling limit and therefore this Tribunal has no jurisdiction,
- (iii) that the declarant acquired Non-agricultural lands and either the declarant or its predecessor-in-title obtained permission, for conversion of land use, under Section 61 of A.P. (Telangana Area) Land Revenue Act, 1317 Fasli, by way of abundant caution.

- (iv) that the declarant is not liable to file any declaration under Section 18(1) of the Act.
- (v) that the lands mentioned in the verification report are not agricultural lands.
- (vi) that the verification officer wrongly, without inspection and enquiry, included non-agricultural lands.
- (vii) that the verification reports were not in accordance with Rule 4 of A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Rules, 1974.
- (viii) that the verification report did not reflect the ground realities of the land in possession of the declarant,
- (ix) that the declarant and other companies of Ecnadu group have jointly developed an integrated complex with a view to achieve "economies of scale by creating infrastructure to their respective business like media, making and telecasting of T.V. Programmes, film making, Tourism, Hotels etc., in the name of Ramoji Film City" and as such the subject matter of the lands have always been put to Non-agricultural use.
- (x) that the proceedings are vitiated by malice of the Government and constitute "grossest" abuse of process of law and are neither just nor maintainable.

The Authorized Officer filed reply statements to the objections raised by the declarant. It is stated in the reply

- (i) That the declaration was duly published as required under the Rules
- (ii) That the Verification Officer conducted the inspection and verification with reference to the contents of the declaration and after due enquiry, the report was submitted which is not vitiated in any manner what so ever.
- (iii) That the alleged permission under Section 61 of A.P. (Telangana Area) Land Revenue Act, 1317 Fasli cannot have the effect of making inapplicable, the provisions of A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973.
- (iv) That on a conjoint reading of Sections 3(c), 3(j), 4 and 5 and read with Section 17 shows that irrespective of any conversion of land use, all lands are covered under the Act, and they have to be included for the purpose of determination of the ceiling area.
- (v) That the conversion under Section 61 of A.P. (Telangana Area) Land Revenue Act, 1317 Fasli is in violation of Section 17 of the A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 and it is liable to be

- disregarded for the purpose of computation of the total holding of the declarant and determination of ceiling area under the Act.
- (vi) That the declarant, in the declaration filed by him suppressed the lands held by it and the allegation of transparency, malice is an after thought, after seeing the report of the verification officer.
 - (vii) That as the declarant is a Company under Section 5(5) of the Act, the share/shares of the individual/individuals in the Company is liable to be included in the said, individual/individuals constituting the company besides, in the holding of the Company.
 - (viii) That the permission allegedly obtained under Section 61 of A.P. (Telangana Area) Land Revenue Act, 1317 Fasli, which is hit by Section 17 of A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 cannot have the effect of changing nature of the land and it is only a permission given to the applicant.
 - (ix) That the alleged development of the land or construction of buildings thereon as on date, after the notified date, that too without complying with the mandatory provisions in A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 have to be disregarded.
 - (x) That the provisions in A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 have overriding effect and the permission under Section 61 cannot make the Act inapplicable to the lands in question.

The Authorized Officer denied the plea of malice raised by the declarant.

In view of the rival contentions the following points will arise for consideration.

- (1) Whether this Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain this case.
- (2) Whether the lands in respect of which the declarant/its vendor claimed to have obtained permission under Section 61 of A.P. (Telangana Area) Land Revenue Act, 1317 Fasli, are liable to exclude from the holding of the declarant.
- (3) Whether the verification reports are vitiated for any reason.
- (4) Whether the lands on which the declarant had made some constructions after acquiring, after the notified date have to be excluded from the holding of the declarant.
- (5) Whether the proceedings before the Tribunal are vitiated either for malice or for any other ground.
- (6) Whether the declarant is holding the land in excess of the ceiling limit under A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 and if so, to what extent?

Before I proceed to consider the points that arise for consideration, it is necessary to deal with some preliminary aspects which were raised in these proceedings, during the course of arguments.

The declarant filed one interlocutory application to reject the verification reports. The ground on which this application was filed is almost the same as that of the objections filed by the declarant to the verification report. On behalf of the Authorized Officer, a counter was filed. The declarant along with the objections filed another interlocutory application to decide the "lack of jurisdiction" of this Tribunal as a preliminary issue. The ground is that as the lands are non agricultural lands in view of section 61 permission this tribunal has no jurisdiction. To this application also the Authorized Officer filed a counter affidavit. The counsel for the declarant, who had made his submissions on the merits of the case, in the light of the objections filed by him, insisted that I should first dispose of these interlocutory applications. He submitted that the provisions of Civil Procedure Code are applicable to the proceedings in this Tribunal and as per the said provisions, I must first dispose of the said interlocutory applications. He relied up on Rule 16 of A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Rules, 1974. It dealt with the nature of the proceedings before the Tribunal. These proceedings are summary in nature. The provisions of Civil Procedure Code are applicable to the extent mentioned in the said Rule. This Rule does not support the contention of the counsel for the declarant. The disposal of these interlocutory applications would substantially, amount to the disposal of the main case itself. No new grounds are urged in these petitions. Under Rule 16 (2) A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Rules, 1974 this Tribunal has power to regulate its proceedings. Even if the provisions of Civil Procedure Code apply, under Order Rule 14 Rule 2, the Court has to pronounce the judgment on all the issues. The issue raised by the declarant about jurisdiction is a mixed question of fact and law and said issue cannot be disposed of as, an issue of law, alone. In this view of the matter, I proceed to dispose of the said interlocutory applications along with the main case.

The counsel for the declarant after completion of the arguments and after the matter is reserved for orders filed a Memo. In the Memo he states that the declarant's right to adduce oral or documentary evidence cannot be denied. He wanted me to take the memo and keep it on record. Accordingly it taken on record. No one had denied any opportunity to the declarant. At no stage the declarant or his counsel stated that they want to adduce any further evidence. This Tribunal deprecates such practice in filing such Memos after the arguments are advanced and after the case is reserved for orders. The main issue involved in the present proceedings is with regard to the binding effect of the permission, claimed to have been obtained, under Section 61 of A.P. (Telangana Area) Land Revenue Act, 1317 Fasli. All the factual aspects about the lands held by the declarant are not in dispute. In view of this no cognizance can be taken of such memo filed on behalf of the declarant.

POINT No.1:

This Tribunal is a Tribunal with in the meaning of that expression in Section 3 (u) of A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973. The declarant has not stated as to how this Tribunal lack jurisdiction. This Tribunal is competent to receive the declaration under Section 8 of the Act and to determine the ceiling area under Section 9 of the Act. If, it is the case of the declarant that the verification reports are vitiated on any grounds what so ever or that the lands are not agricultural lands in view of the said permission obtained for land use, on that basis, it cannot be contended that, this Tribunal has no jurisdiction. In view of the above on this point it is held that this Tribunal has jurisdiction and the point is answered accordingly

POINT No.2:

While considering this point the following aspects are kept in mind. There is no dispute that the declarant is holding the lands as stated in the verification reports. It is also not in dispute that the declarant had not declared these lands, in his declaration. It is also not in dispute that the declarant had acquired these lands after the notified date and the claim of development of this land also is after acquiring the land which is after the notified date. It is also beyond controversy that the declarant had not filed any declaration either under Section 8(1) or under Section 18(1) of the Act. These proceedings are initiated pursuant to the declaration filed under Section 8(2) of the Act.

The contention of the declarant is that in respect of the lands shown in the verification report, the declarant obtained permission under Section 61 of A.P. (Telangana Area) Land Revenue Act, 1317 Fasli, and therefore those lands have to be excluded. It is not in dispute that these permissions, as claimed by the declarant, are obtained after the notified date and they are not in accordance with Section 17(1) of the Act. The declarant has not filed the copies of these permissions claimed to have obtained by it or by its vendor in these proceedings.

Section 61 of A.P. (Telangana Area) Land Revenue Act, 1317 Fasli, read as hereunder:

"61. Occupant to be entitled to construct godowns and wells, etc., or otherwise improve conditions of land:-

(1) Every occupant shall be entitled to construct or repair godowns or wells on land occupied by him or otherwise improve its condition and shall not be entitled except with the written permission of the Collector to appropriate agricultural land to purposes other than agricultural. If no written reply for such permission is given by the Collector for three months from the date of presentation of the application, the applications shall be deemed to have been granted. In every such case the Collector on receipt of the application, shall furnish a written acknowledgment thereof and without unnecessary delay communicate to him the sanction or refusal of the application, and the Collector at the time of granting such application, may, in addition to the new assessment payable under Section 50, if necessary, after recording reasons therefor introduce such conditions as he may have settled with the consent of the occupant.

(2) No occupant of land shall be entitled to construct or repair any tank or kunta without the permission of the Government."

This Section contemplates that every occupant of agricultural land shall not be entitled to appropriate agricultural land to purposes other than agricultural, except with the written permission of the competent authority. An "occupant" is defined under the Act as meaning "a holder in actual possession of un-alienated land". The permission contemplated under this Section is to the applicant. It presupposes that the land in respect of which such an application is made is an agricultural land. The permission obtained will enable the occupant to utilize the land, other wise than for agricultural. It will not have the effect of changing the very nature of the land for any purpose whatsoever.

A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973, is an Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to fixation of ceiling on agricultural holdings and for taking over a surplus lands and to provide for the matters connected therewith. Under Section 28 of the Act, the provisions of this Act were given over-riding effect and it is declared that the provisions of this Act shall have effect notwithstanding anything inconsistent therewith in any other law for the time being in force. In *Yadla Chakradhara Rao Vs State of A.P.* (1990) 2 SCC 523 the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that "the Act was a piece of agrarian legislation enacted with a view to achieve a more equitable distribution of lands for common good and with a view to sub serve the objectives enshrined in Article 39 of the Constitution, being one of the directive principles embodied in the Constitution, therefore, the provisions of such a legislation had to be interpreted liberally and with a view to furthering the object of the legislation and not with a view to defeat the same in a strict and constricted manner in which a taxing law, for instance, might be interpreted"

Section 17 of the Act prohibits alienations or conversions of the lands except in accordance with the said provision. Under this provision unless a declaration was filed under the Act, surplus was determined, and surrendered no alienation or conversion is valid and any such permissions for conversion of land use violating the permission are liable to be disregarded under this Section. The object of this Section is that it enables only those who are within the ceiling limit after adjudication under the Act. To obtain permission for conversion of land use. If the applicant is a excess land holder he should have surrendered the excess land. Only to such person this provision, enable to take cognizance of the permission, for conversion obtained by them. Any such conversion should be before the notified date.

The conversion of agricultural land in to non-agricultural land is prohibited after the notified date under the Act. It is declared that any conversion in contravention of Section 17(1) shall be disregarded. This provision has a overriding effect in view of Section 28 the Act. It is not in dispute that the permissions claimed to have been

obtained by the declarant or their vendors are in violation of this Section. They are liable to be disregarded for the purpose of determining of the total holding of the declarant and the ceiling area under the Act.

It is contended on behalf of the declarant that by reason of the said permission under Section 61 of A.P. (Telangana Area) Land Revenue Act, 1317 Fasli, the lands have become Non-agricultural lands. This cannot be accepted. Language of Section 61 is very clear. At any rate all these permissions are hit by Section 17 of the Act.

In this regard it is to be seen that Section 3(j) of A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973, defined "land" as meaning "a land which is used, capable of being used for the purpose of agriculture or for purposes ancillary thereto including Horticulture, forest land, pasture land, waste land, plantations, top and includes lands deemed to be agricultural lands under the Act. In the light of this definition, the objection raised on behalf of the declarant that it acquired non-agricultural lands which are sheet rock, hilly area and therefore these lands have to be excluded cannot be accepted. It is to be seen in this regard that even according to the declarant, in its application for conversion, it must have stated that these lands are agricultural lands. If the stand of the declarant is true, there would not be any necessity for permission under Section 61 of the Act. The declarant cannot escape with the submission, in the objection, that he made the application for conversion, by way of abundant caution.

In the revenue records, as can be seen from the verification report, these lands are classified as agricultural lands. Therefore, it cannot be contended that by reason of the conversion, these lands cannot be treated as agricultural lands. At any rate, what is contemplated under A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 is determination of ceiling area. It is further contended on behalf of the declarant that in some public interest Writ Petition, W.P. 19623 of 1998, a counter affidavit was filed, wherein it was inter-alia stated that these lands are non-agricultural lands are not attracted by land ceiling Act. This Writ Petition is stated to be still pending. It is contended on behalf of the Authorized Officer that, the proceedings in that writ petition have no relevance to the present proceedings. Subsequent to the said writ petition, the declarant filed the present declaration and the issues that arise for consideration in these proceedings is not be subject matter of that writ petition. Such statements in the counter affidavits in collateral proceedings cannot operate either as estoppels or resjudicata, as rightly contended on behalf of the Authorized Officer. There was no adjudication in that writ petition about these aspects and the binding nature of the permission obtained under Section 61 of the Act, on the proceedings initiated under A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973.

In view of the above on this point it is held that the permission/permissions claimed to have been obtained by the declarant or its vendor are not in accordance with

Section 17(1) of A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 and such permissions for conversion of land use are liable to be disregarded for the purpose of determination of the ceiling area of the declarant under Section 9 of the Act. This point is answered accordingly.

POINT No.3:

A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Rules, 1974 are framed by the Government under Section 27(1) of the Act. It prescribes the procedure for dealing with a declaration and for its disposal. The declarant furnished the declaration in triplicate under Rule 3. It was published as contemplated under Rule 4(1) in the prescribed form. Objections have been called for. There is no dispute in this regard. The declaration was referred to the Tahsildar/Mandal Revenue Officer for verification. Under Rule 5, the Tahsildar/Mandal Revenue Officer has to submit a full and complete report as to:

- (a) correctness of the statements made in the declaration.
- (b) Taram or bhaganna which each land in the declaration bears or is deemed to bear.
- (c) The correct classification and extent of standard holding of each land.
- (d) The relative proportion of the extent of the land of each clause to the extent of the standard holding of the appropriate clause under which the land falls.
- (e) The land revenue payable on each land and such other particulars and information as would be useful to the Tribunal for arriving at a correct determination of the ceiling area and the extent of the land if any held in excess of the ceiling area.

The verification reports contained all these particulars which are required to be mentioned. The declarant has not shown us to how the verification reports are vitiated. The declarant did not dispute that the lands shown in the verification report did not belong to it. The declarant cannot contend that the verification report did not state about the present development of the land by the declarant. In fact in the declaration filed by the declarant nothing has been mentioned by the declarant about these aspects. The declarant except stating that the verification reports are vitiated had failed to show any convincing ground to accept such a plea. It is contended that as the verification reports contained non-agricultural lands the reports are liable to be rejected. The basis for this contention is the permission claimed to have been obtained by it for conversion of the land use under Section 61 of A.P. (Telangana Area) Land Revenue Act, 1317 Fasli. I have already held that the said permissions are liable to be disregarded. In view of the above, on this point, it is held that verification reports are not vitiated and that they are in accordance with A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Rules, 1974. This point is answered accordingly.

POINT No. 4:

The contention of the declarant is that after acquiring these lands, the lands have been developed by it, by utilizing the same for different purposes. He contended that they are utilizing the lands for non-agricultural purposes and that they have constructed permanent buildings, roads, parks and established other infrastructure, settings and scenic parts etc.,. He reiterated what was submitted in para 10 and 11 of the objections. In this regard it is to be noted that the alleged utilization of the land and development of the land after the notified date cannot be countenanced. The declarant acquired agricultural lands after the coming into the force of the Act. It is failed to file any declaration under the Act. It cannot contend that as it had developed the land, though acquired it in violation of the Act, and is in excess of the ceiling limit and do not apply land ceiling laws. Such a failure to file a declaration itself is penal and is punishable under Section 24 of the Act. By reason of the said permission under Section 61 of the Act, the declarant might be entitled to utilize the land for purposes other than agriculture. But it is altogether a different thing, to contend, that with such permission, a declarant can hold land beyond the ceiling limit. If such course is allowed it will enable every one holding excess land beyond the ceiling limit to circumvent the Act, just by developing the land, and utilizing it for other purposes.

The permissions under section 61 of the A.P. (Telangana Area) Land Revenue Act 1317 Fasli, will not enable the declarant for constructions of buildings, laying of roads etc. This permission is only to improve the beneficial enjoyment of the land for agricultural purposes such as construction of sheds, wells etc. This is the purport of the section 61. Any utilization as now claimed by the Declarant is also violation of this permission.

In view of the above on this point it is held that the alleged development and utilization of the land, after acquiring it, after the notified date is liable to be disregarded. This point is answered accordingly.

POINT No.5:

It is contended on behalf of the declarant as stated by it in para 11 of the objections, that the proceedings are vitiated for malice. In this connection it is to be noted that the declarant had filed the declaration, participated in the proceedings, filed a declaration and at the final stage, the declarant come up with this plea. All the proceedings of this Tribunal are matters of record and the declarant obtain certified copies of all the docket endorsements of this Tribunal in this case. The allegation is that, these proceedings are a part of conspiracy of the Government to destabilize the media business carried on by the declarant or by its group. The said allegation is vague and general in nature. Such an allegation is bald and if such allegation is to be accepted, no authority, can conduct any proceeding, as against the declarant under the Act. At any rate, these proceedings are about the ceiling limit of the lands held by the declarant under

A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973. These have no relation or relevance to the alleged media business of the declarant or its group. In this regard it is to be noted that question is about the binding nature of the permissions obtained for conversion of land use. If the declarant is guilty of violation of law and the said permissions are not in accordance with Section 17(1) of the Act, the plea of malice pales in to insignificance. In view of the above on this point it is held that these proceedings are not vitiated for the grounds stated by the declarant. This point is answered accordingly.

POINT No.6:

The declarant is a Company. It is a person within in the meaning of that expression under Section 3(e) of the Act. It is entitled to hold one standard holding. Under Section 5(5) of the Act, the land held by the declarant company is also liable to be included in the individuals who constitute Declarant Company, in the proportion in which, such individual would be entitled, for allotment of the land if the declarant company is wound up. Thus notionally the land held by the declarant has to be proportionally being included in the holding of the individuals, who constitute the declarant company.

As per the verification reports the declarant is holding a total extent of Acs.137-54 of the land. It is equivalent to 2.8340 standard holdings. He is entitled to hold only one standard holding.

It is therefore determined under section 9 of the Act, that the Declarant hold land of 1.8340 S.H. in excess of ceiling on the specified date and is liable to surrender the same under sub section (1) of the section 10 of the Act.

Typed to dictation, corrected by me and pronounce in the open Court on the 8th day of August, 2007.

M.V. Durga Prasad
**LAND REFORM TRIBUNAL-CUM- SPL.GR.DY.
 COLLECTOR AND REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
 RANGA REDDY EAST DIVISION,
 RANGA REDDY DISTRICT**

To
 M/s Margadarshi Chit Fund Ltd.
 (Through Sri M.V. Durga Prasad, Advocate
 R/o Plot No. 332/3 Road No. 82, Jublee Hill, Hyderabad.)

Sri P. Balaji Varma (through Sri P. Krishna, Advocate
 R/o 3-6-364/C, Street No. 1, Himayathnagar, Hyderabad.)

The Authorized Officer, (LR) Ranga Reddy District
 (Through Smt Ch. Vedavani, Advocate
 H.No. 16-3-989/1 B/103 Flat No.1 103 1st Floor, Kings Court Apartment
 Near Bibi Cancer Hospital, Malakpet, Hyderabad - 500 030.)