

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

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOS.2512 AND 2513 OF 2015

CRP No.2512 of 2015

Between:

P.Leelavathi w/o. Nagendra, Aged about 32 years, Occu:Business,
R/o. Pamidi Village and Mandal, Near Communist Kottalla,
RTC Bus Stand, Pamidi, Anantapuram district

.. Petitioner/defendant no.1

AND

G.Ravi s/o. Pullaiah, Aged about 28 years, Occu: Driver in Army in
Delhi, R/o.Pamidi Mandal, Anantapuram and another.

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED : 24.07.2015

-
SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-
-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

-

-
1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may : Yes / No
Be allowed to see the Judgments ? :
 2. Whether the copies of judgment may be marked: Yes / No
to Law Reporters/Journals :
 3. Whether Their Lordship wish to see the fair : Yes / No
Copy of the Judgment ? :

**HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO
CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOS.2512 & 2513 OF 2015**

COMMON ORDER:

The grievance of the petitioner herein is that she filed application before the Court below to reopen the suit and to send the documents to handwriting expert for comparison. Earlier petitioner filed similar application in I.A.No.110/2013. The same was dismissed by the Court below by order dated 02.04.2013. Aggrieved thereby petitioner filed C.R.P.No.2803 of 2013. This Court disposed of the said C.R.P., on 05.07.2015 by giving following directions.

“It is made clear that in case the revision petitioner files any document of the year 2008 containing her signature or summons any document of that nature from any Government Office for comparison and opinion, then the trial Court may reconsider the revision petitioner's request for sending her disputed signatures on Exs.A2 to A4 to the hand-writing expert for that purpose.”

2. As per the said order, petitioner filed I.A.No.299 of 2015 for reopening the suit and I.A.No.300 of 2015 for sending documents to the handwriting expert for comparison.
3. Having regard to the orders passed by this Court, the Court below observed that petitioner does not call any documents containing her admitted signatures from the Government Offices as directed by this court. Only Xerox copies of the Register of Dwakra Mahila Group and pay-in-slip of State Bank of Hyderabad of India, dated 25.08.2008 are filed. She has not even sought for sending of pay-in-slip of State Bank of Hyderabad. Having observed that no explanation from the petitioner as to why petitioner omitted to call for the original documents containing her signature as directed by this Court, both I.As were dismissed.
4. I see no error in the orders passed by the Court below warranting interference by this Court. The said orders of the Court below are in accordance with the directions issued by this Court in C.R.P.No.2803 of 2013.
5. Accordingly, both the Civil Revision Petition are dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions if any pending in the revision petitions shall stand closed.

Date : 24.07.2015
kkm

JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOs.2512 & 2513 OF 2015

Date:24.07.2015

kkm