

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

**THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI**

**WRIT PETITION No.12250 of 2026**

**4<sup>TH</sup> MAY, 2026**

**Between:**

V.Sree Pathi Reddy

... Petitioner

**AND**

The State of Telangana,  
Rep. by its Principal Secretary,  
School Education Department and 6 others

... Respondents

**ORDER :**

This writ petition is filed to issue a Writ, Order, or

“pleased to issue an appropriate Writ, Order, or Direction, more particularly one in the nature of a Writ of Mandamus under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, declaring the action of the Respondent authorities in not considering the Petitioner’s representation dated 07.03.2026, seeking cancellation of the permission granted to Respondent No.7 to run the school under the name SPR high School, as illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional, and violative of the principles of natural justice and consequently direct Respondents No.1 to 6 to consider the said representation and pass appropriate orders, including setting aside i) Memo No.11517/SE. Genl.II/2025 dated 20.06.2025 ii) Proceedings No.L.Dis No 3703/A4/2024 dated 03.07.2025 and iii) Proceedings No. NLG-KDMLP-014-0005 dated 09.07.2025 and pass”

2. Heard Sri Dhonthi Venkat Reddy, learned senior counsel for petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Education, Mr.D.S.Divakar, learned counsel representing Ms.Kota Kalpana, learned Standing Counsel for respondent No.7. Perused the record.

3.1 The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner, a teacher and educationalist, established educational institutions under the name “SPR School of Excellence” in the year 2001. The acronym “SPR” is derived from the initials of his name, Sree Pathi Reddy, by which he is widely known among students. To protect his intellectual property rights, the petitioner obtained registration of trademarks relating to the said name and submitted representations to the official respondents requesting that no permission be granted to any school or institution proposing to use the mark “SPR” or any deceptively similar name as a prefix or suffix.

3.2 Subsequently, the petitioner came to know that respondent No.7 was using the name “SPR High School”. Aggrieved thereby, he instituted C.O.S. No.21 of 2024 before the Court of the Special Judge for Trial and Disposal of Commercial Disputes, Ranga Reddy District, seeking reliefs for infringement of his registered trademarks. He also filed I.A. No.292 of 2024 under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 of Code of Civil Procedure seeking temporary injunction, and the Court, by order dated 08.07.2024, granted an ex-parte ad interim injunction restraining respondent No.7 from using the name “SPR High School” or any other deceptively similar mark containing “SPR” as prefix or suffix. The said order was duly communicated to respondent No.7.

3.3 Despite the subsisting injunction, respondent No.7 continued efforts to establish the school under the name “SPR High School”. On obtaining information under the RTI Act, the petitioner learnt that respondent No.7 had submitted applications dated 28.08.2024 and 29.08.2024 seeking permission to establish schools under the said name. Upon contest by respondent No.7, the trial Court, by order dated 11.08.2025, made the interim injunction absolute.

3.4 However, in violation of the said injunction, the Government of Telangana, School Education (Gen.II) Department, issued Memo No.11517/SE.Genl.II/2025 dated 20.06.2025 permitting respondent No.7 to establish a school under the name “SPR High School”. Thereafter, respondent No.3 issued proceedings L.Dis No.3703/A4/2024 dated 03.07.2025 permitting respondent No.7 to start “SPR High School” for the academic year 2025–26. Further, by proceedings No.NLG-KDMLP-014-0005 dated 09.07.2025, recognition for Classes VI to X was granted to respondent No.7’s school for a period of ten years, i.e., from the academic year 2025–26 to 2034–35.

3.5 The petitioner thereafter submitted several representations, including representation dated 07.03.2026, seeking cancellation of the aforesaid permissions and recognition. As the same were not

considered by the respondent authorities, the petitioner filed the present writ petition.

4. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for School Education, on instructions, submitted that the grievance of the petitioner can be adequately addressed by directing the competent authorities to consider and dispose of the representations submitted by the petitioner, in accordance with law, within a reasonable time.

5. In view of the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the rival claims, deems it appropriate to dispose of the present Writ Petition with a direction to respondent Nos.1 to 5 to consider the representation dated 07.03.2026 submitted by the petitioner. The said respondents shall afford a reasonable opportunity of hearing to both the petitioner and respondent No.7, examine the grievances raised by the petitioner in the light of the material available on record and the orders passed by the competent Civil Court, and thereafter pass a reasoned and speaking order strictly in accordance with law, within a period of three (3) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

Date: 04.05.2026  
BV

JUVVADI SRIDEVI, J