

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

C.R.P.No.5475 of 2016

ORDER:

The 6th defendant in a suit for declaration has come up with the present revision petition challenging an order passed by the trial Court allowing the plaintiffs to take back the originals of Exs.A.1 to A.9 after substituting them with certified copies.

2. Heard Mr. Sreenivasa Rao Velivela, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. P. Nagendra Reddy, learned counsel for the 1st respondent.

3. After the evidence of PW.1 was closed and the documents Exs.A.1 to A.9 marked, the plaintiff came up with an application for return of the original documents on the ground that they wanted to get the benefit under various beneficial schemes floated by the Government for agricultural operations. Believing the same to be true, the trial Court allowed the application.

4. But it has turned out that the respondent has alienated the property on 17.06.2016 much before the trial Court passed an order on 0107.2016.

5. Therefore, the impugned order has been passed by the trial Court on a misrepresentation by the respondents. Hence the order cannot be sustained. Therefore, the civil revision petition is allowed, the impugned order is set aside.

6. As sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

3rd February, 2017
Js.

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

C.R.P.No.5475 of 2016



Date: 03-02-2017

Js.