

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

C.R.P. No.1473 and 1464 of 2016

Between:

Smt.Parveen Sultana

... Petitioner

And

Smt.Muneera Begum

... Respondent

JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED ON 13.04.2016

-
-
-
-

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 HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE G.CHANDRAIAH

-
C.R.P. No.1473 and 1464 of 2016

COMMON ORDER:

Since both the revision petitions have been arose out of
R.A. No.238 of 2014, therefore, they are being disposed of by this common order.

CRP. No.1473 of 2016 has been filed aggrieved by the order dated 09.12.2015 passed in I.A. No.913 of 2015 in R.A. No.238 of 2014 by the Chief Judge, City Small Causes Court, Hyderabad wherein and whereby the petitioner sought to receive certain documents as additional secondary evidence and the Court below vide its impugned order dismissed the said application holding that the rental receipts, which the petitioner intends to bring on record as additional evidence, are totally unconcerned with the default period alleged in the rent control case. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner filed CRP. No.1473 of 2016.

CRP. No.1464 of 2016 has been filed aggrieved by the order dated 09.12.2015 passed in I.A. No.900 of 2015 in R.A. No.238 of 2014 by the Chief Judge, City Small Causes Court, Hyderabad wherein and whereby the petitioner sought to re-open the matter for the purpose of marking of documents as additional secondary evidence as per list of documents, so also the other rental receipts and cheques, which were available on record in the said appeal and the Court below vide its impugned order dismissed the said application holding that since the I.A. No.913 of 2015 itself was dismissed, the application, I.A. No.900 of 2015, is also fails. Aggrieved by the same, CRP. No.1464 of 2016 has been filed.

As could be seen from the material on record, the documents, which the petitioner intends to bring on record are rental receipts for the period March, 2014, July, August and September, 2015 but the default period is from July, 2008 to December, 2011. The petitioner failed to convince the Court how those documents are supporting the case of the petitioner. Therefore,

the Court below has rightly convinced with the contention of the learned counsel for the respondent that the application is filed only to cause hindrance for disposal of the case.

In that view of the matter, I do not see any reason to interfere with the impugned orders as they do not suffer from any legal infirmity and therefore, these revision petitions are liable to be dismissed. Accordingly, both the revision petitions are dismissed.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions, if any, stands closed.
There shall be no order as to costs.

JUSTICE G.CHANDRAIAH

Date: 13.04.2016
LSK