HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K. LAKSHMAN

CIVIL REVISION PETITION Nos.2862, 2863, 2865, 2866 AND 2867 OF 2022

COMMON ORDER:

Heard Mr. Pasham Krishna Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners - defendants and Mr. Swaroop Oorilla, learned counsel for the respondent - plaintiff.

2. C.R.P. No.2862 of 2022 is filed by the petitioners - defendants challenging the order dated 10.10.2022 passed by the learned Judge, Family Court - cum - III Additional District and Sessions Judge, Mahabubnagar (hereinafter referred to as 'trial Court') in I.A. No.339 of 2022 in O.S. No.55 of 2013, wherein the trial Court dismissed the said petition filed seeking to summon the Chief Manager/Authorized Officer, Reserve Bank of India, Hyderabad Branch.

3. C.R.P. No.2863 of 2022 is filed by the petitioners - defendants challenging the order dated 10.10.2022 passed by the trial Court in I.A. No.340 of 2022 in O.S. No.55 of 2013, wherein the trial Court dismissed the said petition filed seeking to summon the Branch Manager, Palamuru Co-Op. Urban Bank, Mahabubnagar.

4. C.R.P. No.2865 of 2022 is filed by the petitioners - defendants challenging the order dated 10.10.2022 passed by the trial Court in I.A. No.341 of 2022 in O.S. No.55 of 2013, wherein the trial Court dismissed the said petition filed seeking to summon the Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Mahabubnagar Branch.

5. C.R.P. No.2866 of 2022 is filed by the petitioners - defendants challenging the order dated 10.10.2022 passed by the trial Court in I.A. No.328 of 2022 in O.S. No.55 of 2013, wherein the trial Court dismissed the said petition filed seeking to summon the then Circle Inspector, Mr. Venkat Reddy, Kushaiguda Police Station in relation to Crime No.459 of 2013.

6. C.R.P. No.2867 of 2022 is filed by the petitioners - defendants challenging the order dated 10.10.2022 passed by the trial Court in I.A. No.342 of 2022 in O.S. No.55 of 2013, wherein the trial Court dismissed the said petition filed seeking to summon the then Circle Inspector, Mr. Somnarayan Singh, II Town Police Station, Mahabubnagar in relation to Crime No.24 of 2014.

7. The petitioners herein are arrayed as defendant Nos.1 and 2 in O.S. No.55 of 2013 who are husband and wife, while respondent

herein is the plaintiff. The plaintiff had filed the said suit O.S. No.55 of 2013 against the defendants for recovery of Rs.30,30,000 (Rupees Thirty Lakhs and Thirty Thousand Only) with future interest @ 18% per annum thereon.

8. Since the *lis* and parties thereto involved in all these revisions are one and the same, all these revisions were heard together and they are being disposed of by way of common order.

9. The respondent herein - plaintiff had filed the aforesaid suit for recovery of money against the petitioners herein - defendants. Plaintiff is a firm dealing with finance business. It has also Money Lenders' License. Its business operations are at Mahabubnagar. While so, the petitioners herein, who are having good acquaintance with couple of partners of respondent firm, approached the respondent firm and requested for a loan to meet their family and other legal obligations and needs. They assured the respondent firm to repay the loan within a week. Accordingly, the respondent firm provided loan of Rs.30.00 lakhs on 25.06.2013 through cheque bearing No.026785, dated 25.06.2013 of State Bank of India, Mahabubnagar Branch in the name of respondent No.1. However, both the petitioners have availed

the said loan jointly, they have executed promissory note and receipt jointly in favour of respondent firm.

10. The petitioners did not keep up their promise in repayment of the aforesaid loan. Later on, the respondent firm came to know that the petitioners have raised various loans from other persons and are planning to sell away their properties to defraud their creditors and are intending to file Insolvency Petition etc. The petitioners also tried to sell away the residential flat situated at Habsiguda with an intention to evade the payments to various creditors. Then, the respondent firm got issued legal notice on 04.07.2013 to the petitioners. But, the petitioners got managed the said notices returned un-served. Thereafter, the petitioners got issued a notice with antedate as 01.07.2013 to one of the Partners of the respondent firm as well as the respondent firm falsely stating that petitioner No.1 had previously availed certain loans from the respondent firm and closed the said loans in the year 2010 and that the said Partner, Mr. Chandra Mouli had fraudulently stolen blank cheques pertaining to the Bank of Maharashtra and Andhra Bank, Naryanaguda and trying to misuse the same. It is further stated that the said Chandramouli and his relatives attempted to kidnap petitioner No.1 on 17.06.2013 and beat him and

his wife and their son and forcibly obtained signatures on blank papers and cheques and that the same was informed to the police. The petitioners have created the aforesaid story in order to evade the loan amount.

11. With the aforesaid contents, the respondent firm filed suit vide O.S. No.55 of 2013 against the petitioners for recovery of Rs.30,30,000/- with future interest @ 18% per annum from the date of suit till passing a decree.

12. After receipt of summons, the petitioners here made their appearance before the trial Court. They have filed written statement denying the suit claim and contended that the respondent firm played fraud on them and the kidnap etc. as mentioned above. In order to prove the same, during pendency of the said suit, the petitioners have filed the aforesaid applications vide I.A. Nos.328, 339, 240, 341, 342 and 343 of 2022 under Order - XVI, Rule - 2 of C.P.C. seeking to summon the aforesaid persons on the following grounds, in order to prove their case:

i) Petitioner No.1 was kidnapped from his residence at Moula-Ali by one of the partners of respondent firm, Mr. Chandramouli;

ii) A case vide Crime No.459 of 2013 was registered for the offences under Sections – 324, 357, 447 and 468 of IPC against one Mr. K. Venkata Shetty, Mr. K. Chandramouli, Mr.K. guruvaiah and Mr. K. Suresh, it was closed without recording the evidence of petitioners herein. Protest petition was filed and it is pending.

iii) Therefore, the then Circle Inspector, Mr. Venkat Reddy is relevant witness to examine in the aforesaid case.

iv) Further, after receipt of summons from the Court, petitioners filed a complaint before the II Town Mahabubnagar Police Station to collect CC Footage of Palamuru Co.Op. Urban Bank, Mahabubnagar from 20.06.2013 to 30.06.2013 so as to know who had submitted the cheque in the bank and who had drawn the amount.

v) He had also requested the Bank to furnish the name of the person along with phone number who presented the cheque.

vi) The petitioners requested to register a criminal case against the Managers of Palamuru Co.Op. Urban Bank, Mahabubnagar, SBI, Mahabubnagar and the respondent firm.

vii) Pursuant to the private complaint filed by the petitioners, a case in Crime No.24 of 2014 was registered by II Town Police Station, Mahabubnagar, but the same was closed as lack of evidence. However, protest petition was filed and it is pending.

viii) In view of the above, the Managers of the above said Banks and the banks played fraud in collusion with the respondent firm.

13. Respondent firm filed counter denying the contentions of the petitioners. It is contended that the petitioners have resorted to all the illegal acts and initiated the aforesaid false proceedings with an intention to escape from the liability in the aforesaid suit. It is also denied that the Bank Managers of the aforesaid two banks played fraud on the petitioners in collusion with respondent firm. Without filing any documents and without disclosing as to on what document they want to examine the said witness, the petitions are not maintainable. Therefore, it sought to dismiss the said petitions.

14. After hearing both sides, the trial Court had dismissed all the aforesaid applications vide common order dated 10.10.2022 on the following grounds:

i) It is well settled that the proceedings of criminal cases are not binding in civil cases;

ii) Managing Partner of respondent firm was already examined as PW.1 and the Manager of SBI, Mahabubnagar was already examined as PW.2 on behalf of the respondent firm and they were cross-examined by the petitioners herein.

iii) Summoning of Manager of RBI is unnecessary.

iv) Summoning of Manager of Palamur Co.Op. Urban Bank, Mahabubnagar also does not deserve any consideration as it is not the case of the petitioners that basing on those documents which were allegedly obtained by one of the Partners of the respondent firm, Mr. Chandramouli, the respondent firm filed the aforesaid suit.

v) The aforesaid applications were filed by the petitioners with an intention to protract the proceedings.

15. Assailing the said orders, the petitioners have filed the present revisions.

i) Mr. Pasham Krishna Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners, would submit that the aforesaid witnesses are relevant to prove that the respondent firm had obtained the cheque forcibly by kidnapping petitioner No.1 - defendant No.1. Both the petitioners are no way concerned and they have not executed the aforesaid pronote. The cheque was presented in Palamuru Co-Op. Urban Bank and the same was encashed on the same day in violation of the guidelines issued by RBI.

ii) According to him, as per the guidelines issued by RBI, an amount of Rs.30.00 lakhs cannot be paid to a person in cash. The partners of respondent firm are very influential and they have managed the Managers and Staff of both the banks.

iii) The Investigating Officers in the aforesaid two (02) crimes i.e., Crime No.14 of 2014 and Crime No.459 of 2013 have closed the said crimes by filing final reports treating them as civil in nature. In fact, the same were not civil in nature. Thus, the Investigating Officers failed to conduct investigation properly. Therefore, the petitioners herein have already filed protest petitions and the same are pending. Thus, the Investigating Officers in the aforesaid two crimes are relevant witnesses and they have to be examined to prove that the petitioners herein are not liable to pay any amount to the respondent firm and that the partners of the respondent firm have obtained the aforesaid pro-note and receipt by kidnapping petitioner No.1.

iv) The petitioners never obtained hand loan from the respondent firm. Cheque was issued in the name of Mr. K. Yadaiah and the same was presented in the account of M/s. Shravani Electrical Engineering Works. One of the partners of respondent firm is also a Director of Palamuru Co-Op. Urban Bank and with his influence, he has managed the Manager of the said Bank and, therefore, he is also relevant witness to show that the petitioners never obtained any loan, and as such, examination of the Manager of SBI is also necessary. No prejudice would be caused to the respondent firm if the aforesaid petitions are allowed and the aforesaid witnesses are summoned to give their evidence in the aforesaid suit.

v) According to him, trial Court, without considering the said aspects dismissed the aforesaid petitions.

With the aforesaid submissions, he sought to set aside the common order dated 10.10.2022 passed by the trial Court.

16. On the other hand, Mr. Swaroop Oorilla, learned counsel for the respondent would submit that the trial Court has considered the aforesaid aspects and dismissed the petitions. The petitioners are taking different stands at different times. Earlier they have filed I.A. No.500 of 2013 under Section – 151 of the C.P.C. to send Exs.A1 and A2 for expert's opinion saying that the signature does not belong to them. The said application was dismissed. The said order was not challenged. Thereafter, they have filed I.A. No.67 of 2019 to send the aforesaid promissory note and cash receipt to Forensic Laboratory for verification of the signatures of defendant No.2 as her signature is forged. The said application was dismissed on 26.03.2019. Assailing the said order, the petitioners herein have filed a revision vide C.R.P. No.1655 of 2019 and the said CRP was dismissed vide order dated 13.04.2022. Thereafter, the petitioners herein have filed the present petitions on 12.09.2022. The said facts would reveal that the petitioners are filing one petition after the other to protract the litigation. They have not given numbers of the protest petitions. The

aforesaid witnesses are not relevant witnesses. The said facts were considered by the trial Court in the impugned order.

With the aforesaid submissions, learned counsel for the respondent sought to dismiss the present revision.

17. The aforesaid facts would reveal that the respondent firm had filed the aforesaid suit vide O.S. No.55 of 2013 against the petitioners for recovery of said amount. The said suit is of the year 2013. On completion of the pleadings and after framing of issues, the trial Court commenced the evidence. On behalf of the plaintiff, PW.1 was examined and Exs.A1 and A2 were marked. The petitioners herein have filed an application vide I.A. No.500 of 2013 under Section - 151 of CPC to send Exs.A1 and A2 for Expert Opinion on the ground that the handwriting and date on the promissory note and cash receipt were tampered. The said application was dismissed on 07.09.2017 and the petitioners did not choose to file revision challenging the said order. Thus, the said order attained finality. Thereafter, the petitioners have filed I.A. No.67 of 2019 to send Ex.A1 promissory note and Ex.A2 cash receipt to the Forensic Laboratory for verification of signature of defendant No.2 as her

signature was forged. The said application was dismissed by the trial Court vide order dated 26.03.2019. Assailing the said order, the petitioners herein have filed a revision vide C.R.P. No.1655 of 2019. The said revision was dismissed on 13.04.2022.

18. The aforesaid facts would reveal that the petitioners herein - defendants have taken the pleadings which are contradictory i.e., i) tampering of the handwriting and date on the promissory note and ii) forging of defendant No.2's signature.

19. It is relevant to note that both the aforesaid interlocutory applications were dismissed and the CRP was also dismissed. After dismissal of the aforesaid CRP, after lapse of almost five (05) months, the petitioners herein have filed the aforesaid five applications to summon the aforesaid witnesses for the purpose of recording their evidence.

20. In **Doni Ushaiah v. Thota Bhooma Reddy**[1], this Court considering the provisions of Civil Rules of Practice, CPC and the principle laid down by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh with regard to mandatory conditions to summon official witness held as under:

---

[1]. 2022 (4) ALD 337 (TS)

"**6A**. In view of the same, it is relevant to extract Rule - 129 of the CRP and Order - XVI, Rules 1 to 5 of the CP, which are as under:

"**129. (76) Production of records in the custody of a Public Officer other than a court:- (1)** A summons for the production of records in the custody of the Public Officer other than a court shall be in Form No. 23 and shall be addressed to the Head of the office concerned and in the case of a summons to a District Registrar or a Sub-Registrar of Assurances, it shall be addressed to the Registrar or Sub Registrar in whose office, or sub-office, as the case may be, the required records are kept.

Provided that, where the summons is for the production of village accounts, including filed measurement books, such summons shall be addressed to the Tahsildar or the Deputy Tahsildar in independent charge as the case may be.

Provided further that when the summons is for production of records in the custody of high dignitaries like the Speaker of the Lok-Sabha or State Legislative Council etc., the summons shall be in the form of a letter of request in Form No. 23-A.

(2) Every application for such summons shall made by an affidavit setting out (1) the document or documents the production of which is require; (2) the relevancy of the document or documents; and (3) in cases where the production of a certified copy or copies and the result of such application.

(3) No court shall issue such summons unless it considers the production of the original necessary or is satisfied that the application for a certified copy has been duly made and has not been granted. The court shall in every case record its reasons in writing and shall require the applicant to deposit in court, before the summons is issued, to abide by the order of the court, such sum as it may consider necessary to meet the estimated cost of making a copy of the document when produced.

(4) On production of the document in obedience to the summons, the court, unless it thinks it necessary to retain the original, shall direct a copy to be made at the expense of the applicant, and shall with all convenient speed return the original retaining the copy.

(5) Unless the court requires the production of the original, every such summons to a public officer shall state that he is at liberty to produce,

instead of the original, a copy certified in the manner prescribed by section 76 of the Evidence Act.

(6) Nothing in the above rules shall prevent a court of its own motion from issuing a summons for the production of public records or other documents in the custody of Public Officer in accordance with sub-rule (1), if it thinks it necessary for the ends of justice to do so. The court shall, in every case, record its reasons in writing."

"**ORDER – XVI**

Summoning and attendance of witnesses:

1. **List of witnesses and summons to witnesses**.**—**(1) On or before such date as the Court may appoint, and not later than fifteen days after the date on which the issues are settled, the parties shall present in Court a list of witnesses whom they propose to call either to give evidence or to produce documents and obtain summonses to such persons for their attendance in Court.

(2) A party desirous of obtaining any summons for the attendance of any person shall file in Court an application stating therein the purpose for which the witness is proposed to be summoned.

(3) The Court may, for reasons to be recorded, permit a party to call, whether by summoning through Court or otherwise, any witness, other than those whose names appear in the list referred to in sub-rule (1), if such party shows sufficient cause for the omission to mention the name of such witness in the said list.

(4) Subject to the provisions of sub-rule (2), summonses referred to in this rule may be obtained by the parties on an application to the Court or to such officer as may be appointed by the Court in this behalf within five days of presenting the list of witnesses under sub-rule (1).

1A. Production of witnesses without summons.—A Subject to the provisions of sub-rule (3) of rule 1, any party to the suit may, without applying for summons under rule 1, bring any witness to give evidence or to produce documents.

2. Expenses of witness to be paid into Court on applying for summons.—(1) The party applying for a summons shall, before the summons is granted and within a period to be fixed 3 [which shall not be later than seven days from the date of making applications under sub-rule (4) of rule 1] pay into Court such a sum of money as appears to the Court to be sufficient to defray the travelling and other expenses of the person summoned in passing to and from the Court in which he is required to attend, and for one day's attendance.

(2) Experts.**—**In determining the amount payable under this rule, the Court may, in the case of any person summoned to give evidence as an expert, allow reasonable remuneration for the time occupied both in giving evidence and in performing any work of an expert character necessary for the case.

(3) Scale of expenses.—Where the Court is subordinate to a High Court, regard shall be had, in fixing the scale of such expenses, to any rules made in that behalf.

(4) Expenses to be directly paid to witnesses.—Where the summons is served directly by the party on a witness. The expenses referred to in sub-rule (1) shall be paid to the witness by the party or his agent.

3. Tender of expenses to witness.—The sum so paid into Court shall be tendered to the person summoned, at the time of serving the summons, if it can be served personally.

4. Procedure where insufficient sum paid in.—(1) Where it appears to the Court or to such officer as it appoints in this behalf that the sum paid into Court is not sufficient to cover such expenses or reasonable remuneration, the Court may direct such further sum to be paid to the person summoned as appears to be necessary on that account, and, in case of default in payment, may order such sum to be levied by attachment and sale of the movable property of the party obtaining the summons, or the Court may discharge the person summoned without requiring him to give evidence; or may both order such levy and discharge such person as aforesaid.

(2) Expenses of witnesses detained more than one day.—Where it is necessary to detain the person summoned for a longer period than one day, the Court may, from time to time, order the party at whose instance he was summoned to pay into Court such sum as is sufficient to defray the expenses of his detention for such further period, and, in default of such deposit being made, may order such sum to be levied by attachment and sale of the movable property of such party; or the Court may discharge the person summoned without requiring him to give evidence; or may both order such levy and discharge such person as aforesaid.

5. Time, place and purpose of attendance to be specified in summons.— Every summons for the attendance of a person to give evidence or to produce a document shall specify the time and place at which he is required to attend, and also whether his attendance is required for the purpose of giving evidence or to produce a document, or for both purposes; and any particular document, which the person summoned is called on to produce, shall be described in the summons with reasonable accuracy.

xxxxx

xxxxx”

6B. Thus, for the purpose of summoning a Public Officer, compliance of the following conditions are mandatory:

(a) Document / documents the production of which is required, shall be set out in the affidavit;

(b) Relevancy of the document / documents shall be explained in the affidavit.

(c) In cases where the production of a certified copy would answer the purpose, whether application was made to the proper officer and the result of such application shall also be indicated in the affidavit.

6C. It is also relevant to note that under Sub- Rule (3) of Rule - 129 of the CRP, no Court shall issue summons unless it considers the production of the original document is necessary or is satisfied that the application for a certified copy has been duly made and has not been granted.

6D. It is also relevant to note that the High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad has considered the said aspect in **Vooda Venkat Rao v. Vooda Surya Ramu @ Surya Rao**. 2016 (6) ALD 59. In the said case, the mandatory conditions of Rule - 129 of the CRP and the scope and ambit of Order - XVI, Rules - 1(2) and 6 of CPC were considered and it was held that in the absence of compliance of the said conditions, the parties are not entitled to seek summoning the documents from a Public Officer.

6E. In **Shaik Ujauddin v. Veerabhadra Uma Devi**, 2013 (1) ALD 207 = 2012 (6) ALT 636, the High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad held that summoning of public servants under Order - XVI, Rule - 1 of CPC cannot be invoked by private parties to summon public servants without adducing proper and relevant evidence to prove their case. It was further held that a private party, in order to substantiate his own plea, cannot seek to drag the Government officials to the Court as that would involve waste of precious time of the officials. Order - XVI Rule 1 of the CPC is not meant for helping litigants who fail to adduce proper and relevant evidence to prove their case and rely solely on the basis of the testimony of public servants. The predominant object of this provision is to enable the Court to summon any witness if it feels that the evidence of such person is necessary for proper and effectual adjudication of the dispute involved in the suit. It is not as if the lower Court, on application of its mind, has felt that the evidence of the Tahsildar is needed for adjudication of the dispute involved in the suit. In a suit involving disputes over immovable properties between two private parties, the Courts shall not ordinarily summon public servants to support the cause of one party unless the Court itself is of the opinion that the evidence of such public servant is required to adjudicate on the seriously disputed questions arising in the suit.

6F. In **V. Rajeshwar v. N. Gurucharanam**, 2007 (1) ALD 154 = 2007 (1) ALT 652, the High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad held that a witness cannot be summoned to let in evidence not supported by pleadings."

21. As discussed above, the petitioners herein intend to examine the Chief Manager/Authorized Officer of the RBI to prove

that the payment of Rs.30.00 lakhs cash is in contravention of guidelines issued by the RBI. To prove the said contention, there is no need to examine any official including the Chief Manager of RBI and the petitioner can as well file a Circular / Guidelines to the said effect. They have not mentioned the Circular Number/Guidelines etc. said to have been issued by RBI to the effect that cash Rs.30.00 lakhs cannot be given to a person. In the absence of the same, the petitioners cannot seek to summon the Chief Manager of RBI. Therefore, considering the said aspect, the trial Court has rightly dismissed the said application.

22. Like-wise, the petitioners intend to examine the Branch Managers of SBI and Palamuru Co-Op. Urban Bank to prove that the aforesaid cheque was issued and encashed on the same day in collusion with the Managing Partner of the respondent firm who is also a Director of the aforesaid Palamuru Co-Op. Urban Bank.

23. As rightly held by the trial Court, the plaintiff itself examined the Chief Manager of the SBI as PW.2 and he was cross-examined by the petitioners herein. During the course of cross-examination, the petitioners should have put the questions on the said

aspects. Instead of doing so, they have filed the aforesaid application seeking to summon the Branch Manager of SBI, Mahabubnagar. Considering the said facts, trial Court has rightly dismissed the aforesaid application filed by the petitioners.

24. With regard to summoning of Branch Manager of Palamuru Co-Op. Urban Bank, the plaintiff firm had already examined PW.1 on its behalf and he was cross-examined by the petitioners. They can as well elicit the aforesaid facts from PW.1. Instead of doing so, they have filed the said I.A. to summon the Branch Manager of Palamuru Co-Op. Urban Bank. According to this Court, examination of the Branch Managers of the said banks is not required and the said aspect was rightly considered by the trial Court.

25. With regard to summoning of Circle Inspectors of Kushaiguda Police Station and II Town Police Station, Mahabubnmagar are concerned, the petitioners herein have mentioned about the crime numbers. They have not mentioned the date on which the aforesaid crimes were closed and final reports were filed under Section - 173 of Cr.P.C. Copies of the final reports were not filed. The petitioners having mentioned about filing of protest petitions,

failed to mention its numbers etc. either before the trial Court or before this Court. However, they can as well file complaints and final reports to establish that petitioner No.1 was kidnapped and the signatures of petitioner No.2 were obtained forcibly. Instead of doing so, they have filed the aforesaid two interlocutory applications i.e., I.A. No.500 of 2013 and I.A. No.67 of 2019 with contradictory pleadings. In the absence of the aforesaid documents, the petitioners cannot seek to summon the Circle Inspectors of the aforesaid two Police Stations mechanically. The trial Court has rightly considered the aforesaid aspects and dismissed the aforesaid applications. As discussed supra, a witness cannot be summoned to let in evidence not supported by pleadings. The contentions in the said I.As. are vague and they are not based on the contentions of the petitioners in written statement. The petitioners utterly failed to lay a foundation and, therefore, the said I.As. are not well founded. This Court is of the opinion that the aforesaid common order is a reasons order and it is on consideration of entire material on record and also the contentions raised by both the parties. The same does not deserve to be interfered by this Court in exercise of its superintendence power under Article - 227 of the Constitution of India.

26. Thus, viewed from any angle, the aforesaid revisions are liable to be dismissed and accordingly the same are dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

27. As stated above, the suit is of the year 2013. Vide order dated 13.04.2022 in C.R.P. No.1655 of 2019, this Court directed the trial Court to dispose of the aforesaid suit within four (04) months from the date of receipt of copy of the said order. Both the parties shall cooperate with the trial Court for expeditious disposal of the original suit. The petitioners instead of cooperating with trial Court filed the aforesaid applications in November, 2022. On the other hand, Mr. Pasham Krishna Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners, would submit that the trial Court is pressuring the petitioners to proceed with the matter in hasty manner. The said submission is factually incorrect since the aforesaid CRP was dismissed on 13.04.2022 directing the trial Court to dispose of the suit in accordance with law within a period of four (04) months from the date of receipt of copy of order, whereas, the petitioners herein have filed the aforesaid applications on 12.09.2022. Therefore, the trial Court is directed to decide the aforesaid suit in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible, and

it shall mindful of the timeline prescribed by this Court in the above CRP.

As a sequel, the miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in the revisions shall stand closed.

K. LAKSHMAN, J

10th January, 2023
Mgr