

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

CIVIL REVISION PETITION Nos.2921 &2936 of 2015

Between :

Sigi Adinarayana S/o.Vemanna,
Aged about 65 yrs, R/o.Malapalli, Katarupalli,
Gandlapenta Mandal, Anantapur District.

.. Petitioner

and

Gummireddi Kesava Reddy S/o.Sanjeeva Reddy,
Aged about 59 yrs, Occu : Agriculturist,
Katarupalli, Gandlapenta Mandal,
Anantapuramu District.

-
_____. Respondent

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED : 07.08.2015

-
SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

-

-

-

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

-

-

-

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

-
CIVIL REVISION PETITION Nos. 2921 & 2936 of 2015

COMMON ORDER :

The petitioner in both these Revisions is the petitioner/Judgment debtor in E.A.No.69 of 2015 and E.A.No.70 of 2015 in E.A.No.974 of 2014 in E.P.No.104 of 2008 in O.S.No.526 of 2005, on the file of Principal Junior Civil Judge, Kadiri.

2. E.P.No.104 of 2008 in O.S.No.526 of 2005 was filed seeking execution of the decree passed in O.S.No.526 of 2005. The evidence of Decree holder was closed on 08.05.2009 and matter was coming for evidence of Judgment Debtor. In spite of granting sufficient opportunity as petitioner did not adduce evidence, Court below eschewed his evidence. Petitioner filed E.A.No.974 and 975 of 2014 to set aside eschewed order, to reopen the E.P., and to permit cross-examination of petitioner. Though further opportunity was afforded to petitioner, subject to fulfillment of conditions, as the petitioner did not fulfill the conditions and did not avail the opportunity provided to him both E.As, were dismissed. These two E.As., are filed to restore E.A.Nos.974 and 975 of 2014. The E.P., is yet to be disposed of. The decree granted in favour of plaintiff is yet to be complied with, in view of the successive E.A.s, filed by the petitioner herein. Having considered the pleas raised by the petitioner and having considered the earlier conduct of the petitioner in prosecuting the matter, the Court below was not inclined to accept the contention of the petitioner to reopen and permit him to cross-examine him in the E.P.

2. I do not see any error in the order passed by Court below

warranting interference by this Court. No reason much less valid reasons are assigned to set aside well considered order and to grant the relief sought by the petitioner. The conduct of the petitioner as dealt with by the Court below disentitle him to seek any relief from this Court. Hence, both the C.R.Ps are dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, in these Civil Revision Petitions, shall stand dismissed.

P.NAVEEN RAO,J

07th August, 2015.
Rds