

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CIVIL REVISION PETITION Nos.1840 AND 1753 of 2021

Date:26.11.2021

Between:

Ginna Malla Reddy, S/o. Late Sanjeeva
Reddy, age 78 years, Occ: Retired,
Government Servant, R/o.H.No.2-7-474,
Excise Colony, Hanamkonda .. Petitioner

And

Eda Giridhar Reddy, S/o. Late Sudhakar
Reddy, age 60 years, Occ: Business,
R/o.H.No.2-7-52, C/o. M. Damodar, MEO.,
Panchayat Raj Teachers Colony,
Near Excise Colony, Hanamkonda,
Presently residing at Flat No.A-1,
H.No.2-7-56/A/1, Suchi Residency,
Excise Colony, Hanamkonda, Warangal City .. Respondent

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CIVIL REVISION PETITION Nos.1840 AND 1753 of 2021

COMMON ORDER:

Heard Sri Gadi Praveen Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Petitioner is the plaintiff in O.S.No.703 of 2010 on the file of the Principal Senior Civil Judge, Warangal. He filed I.A.Nos.480 and 481 of 2019 praying to reopen the plaintiff's evidence for limited purpose of marking the bank documents and to call for the records of Axis Bank, Warangal Branch, previously UTI Bank Limited, pertaining to Account No.292010200001267, respectively. By order dated 03.06.2021, the trial Court dismissed the said applications.

3. According to plaintiff, one Sangi Yadagiri issued the cheques drawn on UTI Bank Limited, Warangal Branch, pertaining to Rainbow Industries, which is a partnership firm, where the defendant and said Sangi Yadagiri are the partners. With that pleading, the plaintiff sought to reopen the evidence for limited purpose of marking the documents pertaining Account No.292010200001267, as mentioned in the application.

4. On due consideration of the respective submissions, the trial Court held that suit is of the year 2010, the evidence of the defendant was closed on 05.02.2019 and the matter was adjourned from time to time for advancing the arguments, whereas the applications were filed in the meanwhile. The trial Court observed that in view of the evidence of DW.1, the plea of the petitioner to

reopen the evidence of the plaintiff and to mark the bank documents is not justified and the applications are accordingly dismissed. Having regard to the long pendency of the suit and the reasons assigned by the trial Court, I do not see any error in rejecting the applications by the trial Court.

5. The civil revision petitions are accordingly dismissed. Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in these revisions shall stand closed.

P.NAVEEN RAO, J

Date:26.11.2021

KH

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CIVIL REVISION PETITION Nos.1840 AND 1753 of 2021

Date:26.11.2021

KH