IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

WEDNESDAY, THE TWELFTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

APPEAL SUIT NO: 663 OF 2018

Appeal filed under Section 96 of Civil Procedure Code, against the Judgment and Decree in O.S.No.61 of 2014 dated 26.10.2017 on the file of the XV Additional District Judge Court, Nuzvid, Krishna District.

Between:

Pajjuru Anjaneyulu, S/o. Venkateswraao, aged 62 yrs, R/o. G.Konduru village and Mandal.

...Appellant/Defendant

AND

1. Dasari Dhanalaxmi, W/o Hanumantha Rao, aged 45 yrs, School assistant, G. Konduru Village and Mandal.
2. Mallela Nagalaxmi, W/o Srinivasa Rao, aged 32 years, Assistant Manager, Cooperative Bank, G.Konduru, Krishna.

...Respondent/Plaintiffs

IA NO: 1 OF 2018

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be

pleased to order stay of all further proceedings pursuant to the judgment and decree in OS.No.61/2014 dt.26-10-2014 on the file of the XV Additional District Judge, Nuzvid, Krishna District.

Counsel for the Appellant: SRI P. NAGENDRA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondents: SRI K. SAI MOHAN RAO

The Court made the following:

APHC010616797/2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI [3524]
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY ,THE TWELFTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

APPEAL SUIT NO: 663/2018

Between:

Pajjuru Anjaneyulu ...APPELLANT

AND

Dasari Dhanalaxmi And Another and Others ...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Appellant:

1.P NAGENDRA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.K SAI MOHAN RAO

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

APPEAL SUIT NO: 663/2018

JUDGMENT: *(per Ravi Nath Tilhari, J)*

Request has been made for adjournment by Sri M.Kranthi Gireesh, learned counsel appearing for Sri P.Nagendra Reddy, learned counsel for the appellant.

2. Sri K.Sai Mohan Rao, learned counsel for the respondents appearing through virtual mode opposes the adjournment.

3. The docket order shows on 23.08.2022, learned counsel for the appellant was not present. On 27.02.2023, there was no representation for the appellant. On 18.04.2023, there was no representation for the appellant. The matter was directed to be listed under the caption 'for dismissal'. On 10.05.2023 at the request of learned counsel for the appellant, the matter was adjourned. On 11.07.2024, there was no representation for the appellant when the matter was taken up for hearing. On that date also, learned counsel for the respondent submitted urgency in the matter. On 02.08.2024 while the respondent was present and reported that he was ready, there was no representation for the appellant. The matter was adjourned for two weeks, finally. On 19.08.2024 at request made on behalf of learned counsel for the appellant, the matter was adjourned, providing that on the next date of listing learned counsel for both parties shall be ready for arguing the appeal. Again on 02.09.2024 at the request made on behalf of learned counsel for the

appellant appearing through virtual mode, the matter was adjourned on his request. On 23.09.2024, the request was made for adjournment on behalf of learned counsel for the appellant, the matter was adjourned. On 21.10.2024, again it was reported that the paper book was ready and the matter had to be heard finally. The matter was directed to be listed under the caption for hearing.

3. Today also the request is made for adjournment.

4. We are not inclined to grant adjournment.

5. Inspite of granting opportunity to learned counsel appearing for the appellant to argue the matter, he did not advance the arguments saying that he has no instructions.

6. The appeal is dismissed for 'want of prosecution'.

No order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall also stand closed.

Sd/- K TATA RAO
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The XV Additional District Judge, Nuzvid, Krishna District. (with records)
2. One CC to Sri P. Nagendra Reddy, Advocate [OPUC]
3. One CC to Sri K. Sai Mohan Rao, Advocate [OPUC]
4. The Section Officer, V.R. Section, High Court of Andhra Pradesh.
5. Three CD Copies

Pmg
sree

HIGH COURT

DATED:12/03/2025

JUDGMENT

AS.No.663 of 2018



DISMISSING THE APPEAL SUIT FOR NON-PROSECUTION WITHOUT COSTS