

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

* * * *

CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.3072 of 2015

Between: —

Yamarthi Seshamma and others.

.. Petitioners

And

M/s. Shriram City Union Finance Company Limited,
Rep. by its GPA holder/Divl. Manager M.Rama Rao,
Sattenapalli Branch, Sattenapalli,
Guntur District.

.. Respondent

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 04-08-2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

**HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.SHANKAR NARAYANA**

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
Yes/No
may be allowed to see the Judgment?

2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
Yes/No
marked to Law Reporters/Journals

3. Whether Their Lordship wish to
see the fair copy of the Judgment?
Yes/No

**HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.SHANKAR NARAYANA**

CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.3072 of 2015

—
ORDER : *(Per Hon'ble Sri Justice R.Subhash Reddy)*

This Civil Revision Petition is filed aggrieved by the order dated 17.06.2015 in E.P.No.37 of 2014 in AOP.No.893 of 2011 passed by the Senior Civil Judge, Sattenapalli, Guntur District.

There is an award obtained by the respondent Finance Company. To execute the award, the respondent/decreed holder has filed E.P.No.37 of 2014 seeking attachment of the E.P schedule movable properties and sale thereof. In the said EP, the petitioners herein have filed counter affidavit stating that as they are Government employees, the respondent/decreed holder can seek attachment of their salaries and requested not to proceed against the E.P schedule movable properties. The Court below overruled the said objection and passed the impugned order allowing the E.P with costs.

Even before this Court, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that though the petitioners are Government employees, instead of seeking attachment of their salaries, the respondent has sought for attachment of the E.P. schedule movable properties and, as such, prayed to set aside the impugned order.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the impugned order and other material available on record.

In the absence of any prohibition for attachment of E.P schedule movable properties, merely because the petitioners have prayed for attachment of their salaries instead of attaching the E.P. schedule movable properties, the respondent is not bound to confine its prayer to attachment of salaries only. It is for the decree holder to seek execution of the award in the method and manner provided under the Code of Civil Procedure, but the petitioners have no right to dictate any terms to the respondent to adopt particular mode for execution of the award. In these circumstances, we do not find any merit in this revision warranting interference of this Court in exercise of revisional jurisdiction under Section 115 of C.P.C.

Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

As a sequel, pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

JUSTICE A.SHANKAR NARAYANA

04.08.2015
V V