THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT

CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.3213, 3214, 3215, 3216, 3226, 3284, 3325, 3340 and 3506 of 2016

COMMON ORDER:

Heard Mr. J.U.M.V. Prasad for revision petitioner in these revision petitions and Mr. K. Soma Konda Reddy for respondents.

2. One M. Noorjahan is the revision petitioner in all these revision petitions. The revision petitioner filed applications to reopen, receive documents stated in respective IA's and recall the revision petitioner for further examination. Through the orders impugned in the revision petitions, the learned trial Judge rejected all the prayers.

3. There are three suits between the parties viz. O.S.Nos.10 and 28 of 2008 and O.S.No.13 of 2012. Learned counsel appearing for parties submit that the orders impugned in the revisions are substantially similar and for convenience, the allegations,
the objections and the findings recorded by the trial Court in CRP.No.3213 of 2016 are referred to.

4. The revision petitioner filed I.A.No.41 of 2016 under Order VII Rule 14(3) of the Civil Procedure Code for permission to file the following documents:

1. Certified copy of neat copy of Amended written statement in O.S.No.8/2000.
2. Certified copy of vakalath filed in O.S.No.8/2000 Sri. Syed Shafaquath Hussain and Sri.M.Akbar Ali Baig, Advocate on behalf of Habbed Khatoon and Noorjahan.
3. Certified copy of Joint memo filed on behalf of both parties signed by the counsel for plaintiff and defendants in O.S.No.8/2000.
4. Certified copy of Compromise petition filed on behalf of both parties signed by the counsel for plaintiff and defendants in I.A.nil of O.S.8/2000.
5. Certified copy of Final decree passed in O.S.No.8/2000.

6. Certified copy of registered gift deed dated 1-10-2002 executed by M.Habeeb Khatoon in favour of plaintiff.

The prayers in the other applications are to reopen and recall the revision petitioner to bring on record these documents.

5. The trial Court has considered the reasons stated by the revision petitioner in great detail and has taken note of orders of this Court in CRP.No.2469 of 2014; CRP.No.2474 of 2014 and CRP.No.2475 of 2014. One of the reasons weighed with this Court for rejecting the prayers of revision petitioner herein is as follows:

> "…I have carefully perused the plaint filed by the Petitioner in O.S.No.13/2012 and there is no relevancy for the present documents sought to be filed, as could be seen from averments made in the plaint. On that ground **also** the applications filed by the Petitioner are liable to be dismissed …"
>
> (emphasis added).

6. It is not in dispute that the revision petitioner through instant application seeks permission of the Court to file the very documents on which finding is recorded by this Court. In my considered view,
when the suits are posted for arguments, the applications are rightly rejected by the trial Court. I do not see any illegality or irregularity to interfere with the orders impugned in the revision petitions and
the revision petitions fail.

7. Mr. J.U.M.V. Prasad submits that the suits are posted for judgment on 29.08.2016. The revision petitioner could not and did not advance arguments in these suits because the revision petitions are pending before this Court. If the trial Court pronounces judgment without hearing arguments of revision petitioner, the revision petitioner will suffer irreparable loss and injury. Hence, prays for an opportunity to advance arguments in these suits.

8. Mr. K. Soma Konda Reddy, though opposes the request,
to avoid further technicalities in the matter, requests that a particular date can

be given for the submissions of revision petitioner to advance arguments, without disturbing the schedule already prescribed by the trial Court.

9. I am satisfied, to meet the ends of justice, the trial Court can be directed to permit the revision petitioner to advance arguments in these suits on 26.08.2016. Learned counsel appearing for petitioner and respondents are directed to inform their counter parts in the Court below and file a joint memo to that effect.

With the above observations, the civil revision petitions are dismissed. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

S. V. BHATT, J

August 23, 2016
Note: Furnish C.C. forthwith.
(**B/o**) DSK