

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

FRIDAY, THE THIRTY FIRST DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N.TUKARAMJI

APPEAL SUIT NO: 573 OF 2007

Appeal filed under Section 96 of C.P.C. against the judgment and decree dated 17.07.2007 passed in O.S.No.170 of 2003 on the file of the court of the V Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy District.

Between:

B.Arjun Reddy, S/o.Late C.K.Reddy, Occ: Business R/o.H.No.3-5-576,
Himayathnagar, Hyderabad.

...APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF

AND

1. Boda Sudhakar Reddy,, S/o.Ram Reddy RTC Employee R/o.H.No.1-33,
Bairamalgudda, L.B.Nagar Municipality, Ranga Reddy District.
2. Baby B.Priyanka,, D/o.Boda Sudhakar Reddy Student
3. Master B.Sai Teja Reddy,, S/o.Boda Sudhakar Reddy, Student
Respondents 2 and 3 being minors represented by their natural guardian and
mother Smt. B.Sumathi, W/o.B.Sudhakar Reddy, R/o.Plot No.26,
Mallikarjunanagar, Bairamalguda, Ranga Reddy District.
4. The Manager, Union Bank, Dilsukhnagar Branch,, Hyderabad.

...RESPONDENTS/DEFENDANTS

ASMP. NO: 2239 OF 2007

Petition under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 R/w 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 grant injunction, pending the appeal, restraining the respondents from alienating the schedule property situated Plot bearing No.26 in Sy. 14, with ground and first floor semi finished admeasuring 289 Sq. Yards with built up area of 1500 Sq. feet Mallukarjuna Nagar, Bairamalguda, LB.Nagar Municipality.

Counsel for the Appellant: Ms. GAYATRI

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 to 3: SRI A. VENKATESH

The Court made the following: JUDGMENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE N. TUKARAMJI

APPEAL SUIT No.573 OF 2007

JUDGMENT:

The present appeal suit is filed by the appellant aggrieved by the judgment and decree dated 17.07.2007 passed in O.S. No.170 of 2003 on the file of the learned V Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy.

2. Heard Ms. Gayatri, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr. A.Venkatesh, learned counsel for the respondents.

3. Today, when the matter is taken up for hearing, learned counsel for the respondents informed that during the pendency of the appeal suit, the sole appellant died and the counsel appearing for the appellant sought time to take steps to bring the legal representatives on record and till date, no steps have been taken to bring the legal representatives on to record.

4. On this aspect, learned counsel for the appellant submits that, in spite of best efforts, no instructions have been received from the legal representatives. As such, she could not take required steps.

5. In this factual position, as the sole appellant died and none came on to record to pursue the appeal, the Appeal Suit is dismissed for default, as abated. No costs.

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


//TRUE COPY//

Sd/- T. KRISHNA KUMAR
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The II Additional District Judge (FTC) Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar. (with records if any)
2. One CC to Ms. Gayatri, Advocate [OPUC]
3. One CC to Sri A. Venkatesh, Advocate [OPUC]
4. Two CD Copies



HIGH COURT

DATED:31/01/2025



JUDGMENT

AS.No.573 of 2007

**DISMISSING THE APPEAL
AS ABATED.**

6

11/4/2025