

**WP(PIL) NO: 22 of 2017**

B Madhan Kumar Reddy

...Petitioner

Vs.

The Union of India and others

...Respondents

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Kambhampati Ramesh Babu

Advocate(s) for Respondent(s): Mr. K S Murthy, Senior Counsel
GP for Forests, GP for Mines and
Geology, GP for Revenue**CORAM : THE CHIEF JUSTICE DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR
SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI****DATE : 8th October, 2025****P C :**

The issue that has been highlighted in the present PIL is with regard to the mining rights which were given to private respondent No.11 in regard to Sy.No.696 falling in Momidi Village, which according to the petitioner was forest land.

It appears, as is stated by learned counsel for the respondents, that an area of 92.40 acres in Sy.No.696 was allotted to respondent No.11 for conducting the mining operations.

It is stated that this area which was earlier earmarked as 'Forest Reserve Poramboke' was subsequently reflected as 'Jungle Poramboke' and thus came within the purview of the Revenue Department which subsequently enabled the allotment in favour of respondent No.11 for mining operations.

We fail to understand as to how an area which is otherwise declared as reserved forest could have been reflected as Jungle Poramboke and allotted by the mines department for mining operations.

We direct that a Committee be constituted under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary, comprising the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests and the Principal Secretary of Revenue Department, who shall examine the issue and submit a report to this Court.

In case the Committee finds that the conversion was only with a view to facilitate the allotment of mining rights in favour of respondent No.11, the same be also specifically stated in the report.

The Committee shall also state as to what action it contemplates to initiate against the concerned in case it is found that the reclassification was done for *mala fide* reasons.

Report be submitted within six weeks.

We are informed that as on date no mining operations are being conducted by respondent No.11 inasmuch as the environmental clearance obtained by respondent No.11 has since been stayed by the orders of the NGT.

Delete from the column 'likely to be declared as infructuous' and list for consideration on 19.11.2025.

DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR, CJ

RAVI CHEEMALAPATI, J

Vjl