

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD  
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH**

\*\*\*\*

**C.R.P. No.4985 of 2015**

Between:

Boppudi Venkata Swamy

...

Petitioner

And

Boppudi Ranga Rao

...

Respondent

**JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED ON 11.12.2015**

-

-

-

-

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G. CHANDRAIAH**

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers  
may be allowed to see the Judgments? :
2. Whether the copies of judgment may be  
marked to Law Reporters/Journals. :
3. Whether their Ladyship/Lordship wish to  
see the fair copy of the Judgment? :

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G. CHANDRAIAH**

**C.R.P. No.4985 of 2015**

**ORDER:**

This revision petition has been filed challenging the order dated 29.09.2015 passed in I.A. No.420 of 2014 in O.S. No.225 of 2009 by the Principal Junior Civil Judge, Nuzivid.

The petitioner filed I.A. No.420 of 2014 in O.S. No.225 of 2009 under Section 45 of Indian Evidence Act to send Ex.A-1 to the hand writing expert for comparison of the endorsement alleged to have been made by him and to permit him to examine the hand writing expert.

On behalf of the respondent, in the said I.A., counter was filed stating that the petitioner previously filed I.A. No.349 of 2013 seeking similar relief and the same was allowed, but the petitioner neither appeared before the Court for taking specimen signatures, nor paid the necessary fee to send the document to the expert, as directed by the Court below.

The Court below vide its impugned order dismissed the said I.A. observing that the petitioner earlier filed I.A. No.349 of 2013 with the similar relief and the Court below allowed the same but the petitioner did not come forward to comply with the same and thereafter, the matter was underwent several adjournments for about one year and then dismissed the said earlier I.A. Further, it is also observed that the attitude of the petitioner in filing the present application that too without referring to the reason for dismissal of earlier application, is only to protract that litigation without getting it disposed off.

In that view of the matter, I do not see any reason to interfere with the impugned order as it does not suffer from any legal infirmity and therefore, the same is liable to be dismissed.

Accordingly, this revision petition is dismissed.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions, if any, stands closed.

There shall be no order as to costs.

---

JUSTICE G.CHANDRAIAH

Date: 11.12.2015

LSK