

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.656 of 2015

-
27.02.2015

Between:

Abdul Lateef

...Petitioner

And

P.Suryanarayana and others

...Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner: Sri Kowturu Vinaya Kumar

Counsel for respondent: --

The Court made the following:

-

-

-

ORDER:

This civil revision petition arises out of the order, dated 23.01.2015, in I.A.No.898 of 2014 in O.S.No.221 of 2013 on the file of learned II Additional Junior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar.

The petitioner filed the aforementioned suit for perpetual injunction against the respondents. Respondent No.1 filed the aforesaid I.A. for appointment of an Advocate Commissioner for the purpose of demarcation of the suit schedule properties with the assistance of the Mandal surveyor with a view to resolve the dispute involved in the suit. Though the petitioner has resisted the said application, the lower Court, by the order under revision, allowed the I.A.

After hearing Sri Kowturu Vinaya Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, I am of the view that the discretion exercised by the lower Court in favour of the petitioner by allowing the I.A. need not be interfered by this Court by the exercise of its supervisory jurisdiction, as the Advocate Commissioner was appointed for the purpose of identifying the suit schedule properties, with reference to the boundaries, with the assistance of the Mandal Surveyor. In a way, respondent No.1 - defendant No.1 has undertaken the task of the petitioner - plaintiff by filing such an application. Instead of welcoming such a move, the petitioner – plaintiff has been needlessly opposing the same.

From the above discussion, I do not find any merit in the revision petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.

As a sequel to dismissal of the Civil Revision Petition, C.R.P.M.P.No.863 of 2015 filed by the petitioner for interim relief also stands dismissed.

(C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY, J)

27th February, 2015

GHN