

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

**THURSDAY, THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FOUR**

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SAMBASIVARAO NAIDU**

CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS APPEAL NO: 911 OF 2006

Appeal Under Section 37 of Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996 against the Common Order dated 26-06-2006 made in O.P.No. 2049 of 2005 on the file of the III Additional Chief Judge, city Civil Court, Hyderabad.

Between:

1. M/s National Buildings Construction Corporation Limited, NBCC Bhavan, Lodhi Road New Delhi, Rep. by its Chairman and Managing Director Chairman
2. Project Manager, M/s National Buildings Construction Corporation Ltd., Gayatri Enclave, Savarkar Nagar, Hyderabad

...APPELLANTS

AND

1. M/s Allam Subbarayudu, Rep. by its Managing Partner Sri A. Subbarayudu, Yousufguda Check Post, Hyderabad
2. Sri Justice I. Venkatanarayana, Former Judge, High Court of A.P. Sudhamma, road No. 10, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad

...RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Appellants : M/s J. Seshagiri Rao & K. Sai Kumar

Counsel for Respondent No. 1 : Sri V. Prasad Rao

The Court delivered the following JUDGMENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY

AND

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE SAMBASIVA RAO NAIDU

CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS APPEAL No.911 of 2006

JUDGMENT: *(per Hon'ble Sri Justice P.SAM KOSHY)*

Heard Mr.J.Seshagiri Rao, learned counsel for the appellant.

2. The present is a Civil Miscellaneous Appeal which has been filed assailing the order dated 26.06.2006, passed in O.P.No.2049 of 2005, by the III Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad.

3. Today, when the matter is taken up for hearing, learned counsel for the appellant submits that the matter is getting adjourned for the service of notice to the respondents. He further submits that inspite of best efforts the service of notice could not be made out, in the absence of known address of the respondent.

4. Considering the fact that the appeal is of the year 2006 and it is pending since 18 years, we are of the considered opinion that no fruitful purpose would be served keeping the appeal pending any further. Accordingly, we dispose of the

present appeal reserving the respondent of the parties to move appropriate application to revive the same, in case, if there is any grievance pending.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed. No order as to costs.

Sd/- B.S. CHIRANJEEVI
JOINT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//


SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The III Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad. (with records)
2. One CC to M/s J. Seshagiri Rao, Advocate [OPUC]
3. One CC to Sri C. Sai Kumar, Advocate [OPUC]
4. One CC to Sri V. Prasad Rao, Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CD Copies 

HIGH COURT

DATED: 18/07/2024

JUDGMENT

CMA.No.911 of 2006

DISPOSING OF THE CMA

PA
24/10/24
7 Copies