

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE No: W.P.Nos.24835 and 24837 of 2025

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
2.	22.08.2025	<u>HCJ (AKrS,J) & GMM,J</u> Heard Mr.Aryama Sundaram and Mr.Dama Seshadri Naidu, learned Senior Counsel, appear for Mr.Jaggannagari Venkat Sai, and Mr.Ponugoti Mohith Rao, learned counsel for the petitioners in W.P.Nos.24835 and 24837 of 2025, respectively, and Mr.S.Niranjan Reddy, learned Senior Counsel along with Mr.A.Sudershan Reddy, learned Advocate General for the State of Telangana, duly assisted by Mr.I.V.Siddivardhana and Mr.Pottigari Sridhar Reddy, learned Special Government Pleaders, appear for respondent Nos.1 and 2. The Commission of Inquiry on Kaleshwaram Project (for short 'the Commission') constituted, <i>vide</i> G.O.Ms.No.6, Irrigation and CAD (Projects-IV) Department, dated 14.03.2024, respondent No.3 herein, has submitted its Report on 31.07.2025 to the Government of Telangana. The petitioners herein, being the former Minister and former Chief Minister of the State of Telangana, are aggrieved by the findings alleged to have been made against them	Transferred to i/o folder, before corrections, if any.

	without service of notice under Sections 8B and 8C of the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952 (for short 'the Act'). The petitioners also contend that the contents of the Report and the alleged findings, touching upon their conduct and reputation, have been brought into the public domain by way of a Power Point Summary of the Report on 04.08.2025. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners relying upon the decisions of the Apex Court in the cases of Kiran Bedi v. Committee of Inquiry [(1989 1 SCC 494] and State of Bihar v. L.K.Advani [(2003) 8 SCC 361], contend that the findings, which touch upon the conduct and reputation of the petitioners without giving them an opportunity in terms of Sections 8B and 8C of the Act, should not be acted upon. The petitioners have sought quashing of G.O.Ms.No.6 dated 14.03.2024 by which the Commission was constituted. They have also prayed for a declaration that the alleged Report issued by the Commission is prejudicial and defamatory against the petitioners as revealed by the respondents by way of Power Point Presentation made on 04.08.2025 without following the	
--	--	--

		provisions of Sections 8B and 8C of the Act. Petitioners have also sought a declaration that repeated publication of report dated 31.07.2025 without furnishing a copy to the petitioners is manifestly arbitrary, illegal, <i>mala fide</i> and in violation of principles of natural justice. Learned Advocate General appearing for the State has yesterday during the course of hearing produced the written instructions contained in Letter No.8141/Proj-IV/2023 dated 20.08.2025, which is to the following effect: “Sub: Irrigation & CAD Dept. – Commission of Inquiry into certain allegations of irregularities and embezzlement of public funds in construction of the Medigadda, Annaram and Sundilla barrages under the Kaleshwaram Project – Submission of Information – Reg. Ref: G.O.Ms.No.6, I & CAD (Projects-IV) Deptt., Dated 14.03.2024. *** In the G.O. cited, Government have appointed an Inquiry Commission headed by Justice Sri Pinakini Chandra Ghose, Former Judge of Supreme Court of India, to conduct Judiciary Inquiry into certain allegations of irregularities and embezzlement of public funds in construction of the Medigadda, Annaram and Sundilla barrages under the Kaleshwaram project. 2. The Commission has conducted its inquiry and submitted its Inquiry Report on 31st July 2025 to the Government. 3. Govt., vide Memo No.78/Cabinet/A2/2025, Dated:01.08.2025 constituted a committee comprising of the following officers to study the Commission’s	
--	--	---	--

(PTO)

		report and to submit to the Council of Ministers duly following the Telangana Government Business Rules: i. Principal Secretary to Govt., Irrigation & CAD Department ii. Principal Secretary to Govt., (Poll), General Administration Department - iii Secretary to Government, Law Department. The Officers' Committee has submitted the Summary of the Commission's Report for the perusal of the Council of Ministers along with the Power Point Presentation. 4. The Cabinet, during its meeting held on 04.08.2025, <i>"Resolved to accept the Report of the Commission of Inquiry and further resolved to place the same before the Assembly for discussion."</i> It is contended that the Government has decided to accept the Report of the Commission and place it before the Assembly for discussion. Yesterday, the learned Advocate General was specifically asked as to whether the Government is going to take any action on the basis of the findings of the Report before placing it before the Assembly. Today, on the basis of the written instructions contained in Letter No.8141/Proj-IV/2023 dated 21.08.2025, learned Advocate General has made categorical submissions that further action on the Report would be taken only after discussion on the Floor of the Assembly. The relevant extract of the Letter dated 21.08.2025 is quoted hereunder:	
--	--	---	--

(PTO)

		“Sub: Irrigation & CAD Dept. – Commission of Inquiry into certain allegations of irregularities and embezzlement of public funds in construction of the Medigadda, Annaram and Sundilla barrages under the Kaleshwaram Project – Submission of Information – Reg. Ref: 1. G.O.Ms.No.6, I & CAD (Projects-IV) Deptt., Dated 14.03.2024. 2. Govt. Letter No.8141/Proj-IV/2023, dated: 20.08.2025. In continuation of this office letter 2nd cited, and as desired by the Learned Advocate General, it is informed that: 2. The Commission has conducted its inquiry and submitted its Inquiry Report on 31st July 2025 to the Government. 3. “On 4th August 2025, the Cabinet in its meeting held on 04.08.025, “resolved to accept the Report of the Commission of Inquiry and further resolved to place the same before the Assembly for discussion”, further action on the report would be after the discussion on the floor of the Assembly.” Petitioners are apparently prejudiced because of alleged publication of the contents of the Report through a press conference. They also allege that the same is on the official website of the State Government. Before Assembly undertakes a discussion on the Commission’s Report, and moreover, when the Government accepted the report and resolved to place before the Assembly for discussion, the Report should not be placed in public domain. In case the Report has been uploaded on any	
--	--	---	--

(PTO)

		official website of the Government, it should be taken down. The apprehension of the petitioners is that if findings recorded by the Commission touching upon their conduct and reputation without following the prescription of law under Sections 8B and 8C of the Act and in violation of the principles of natural justice are acted upon, the same would be improper and impermissible in law. The learned Advocate General in his reply has made categorical statements today on the basis of the written instructions contained in the letter dated 21.08.2025 that further action on the report could be after the discussion on the Floor of the Assembly. It therefore, appears that the apprehension of the petitioners that action could be taken on the basis of the findings of the Report allegedly touching upon the conduct and reputation of the petitioners, is misplaced. The Act provides for laying down the Report of the Commission before the Floor of the House, where it is to be debated and discussed. At this stage, when the State Government has come out with a categorical assertion that no action	
--	--	--	--

		is going to be taken on the basis of any such findings in the Report, no further interim directions are required to be passed in that regard. Respondents No.1 and 2 are required to file a detailed counter-affidavit to the averments and grounds raised in the writ petitions within a period of 4 weeks. One week time thereafter is allowed to the petitioners to file reply, if any. List the matter on 07.10.2025. _____ HCJ (AKrS,J) _____ GMM,J GJ	
--	--	---	--