

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S. RAVI KUMAR

CRP No.5753 of 2007

-
Date:13.04.2016

Between:

Katta Balaiah

... Petitioner.

AND

Nimmala Venkata Rao and others.

...Respondents.

The Court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S. RAVI KUMAR

CRP No.5753 of 2007

ORDER:

-
This revision is preferred questioning order dated 29-10-2007 in ATA.No.102/1999 on the file of Tenancy Appellate Tribunal-cum-Principal District Judge, Guntur.

2. Appellant herein filed ATC.No.15/1992 against eight persons under Section 16 of A.P. Tenancy Act to declare him as cultivating statutory tenant in respect of petition schedule land and for a consequential permanent injunction restraining the respondents 1 to 8, their men and supporters from any way interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment and permit him to deposit the annual rents and that application was enquired into. On a consideration of oral and documentary evidence of both parties, Special Officer-cum-Principal Junior Civil Judge, Guntur allowed the application and declared the revision petitioner herein as cultivating tenant. Questioning said order, respondents 1 to 5 herein

preferred appeal to the appellate Tribunal i.e., Principal District Judge, Guntur and the Appellate Tribunal, on a reappraisal of the entire material, allowed the appeal and set aside the order of the Special Officer-cum-Principal Junior Civil Judge dated 15-10-1999. Aggrieved by the said order, present revision is preferred.

3. During pendency of appeal, respondent No.9 herein was impleaded as fifth respondent to the appeal. The appeal against respondents 1 to 8 who are the original respondents in the ATC was dismissed for non-compliance of the order dated 09-8-2011 and the revision petitioners filed application to set aside that order and those petitions were allowed and subsequently the revision against R1 to R8 was dismissed on 23-2-2016 for non-compliance of the order dated 11-2-2016. The revision against the main contesting parties is already dismissed and R9 is only a formal party, therefore nothing survives in the revision in view of the dismissal against R1 to R8.

4. Considering the above facts, revision is dismissed as infructuous. No costs.

5. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this Civil Revision Petition, shall stand dismissed.

JUSTICE S. RAVI KUMAR

Date:13.04.2016

mrh