

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY SIXTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE TIRUMALA DEVI EADA

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 3516 OF 2025

Petition under Article 227 of the constitution of India aggrieved by the Order dated 23/07/2025 Passed in I.A.No.42 of 2023 in O.S.282 of 2019 on the file of the Court of the II Additional Junior Civil Judge, Kollapur.

Between:

Smt.Guvvala Prameelamma, W/o Parvathalu, Age-50 years, Occ-Agriculture
R/o.Dedinenipally Village, Peddakothapally Mandal, Nagar Kurnool District

...Petitioner/Defendant

AND

Sri.P.Mallesha, S/o. Narayana, Age- 29 years, Occ-Agriculture, R/o.Dedinenipally
Village, Peddakothapally Mandal, Nagar Kurnool District.

...Respondent/Plaintiff

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

Petition under Section 151 of CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay further proceedings in I.A.No.42 of 2023 in O.S.No.282 of 2019 dated 23-07-2025 on the file of II Addl Junior Civil Judge, Kollapur till the disposal of the Revision petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner :SRI JAGAN MOHAN REDDY KOTHA

Counsel for the Respondent : _____

The Court made the following: ORDER

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE TIRUMALA DEVI EADA

CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.3516 of 2025

ORDER:

1. Aggrieved by the orders passed by the learned II Additional Junior Civil Judge, Kollapur in I.A.No.42 of 2023 in O.S.No.282 of 2019, dated 23.07.2025, in allowing the petition filed to receive the documents, the present Civil Revision Petition is filed.
2. Heard Sri K.Jaganmohan Reddy, learned counsel for the revision petitioner.
3. Learned counsel for the revision petitioner submits that I.A.No.42 of 2023 is filed under wrong provision of law. The petitioner before the Trial Court is the plaintiff and he ought to have filed a petition under Order 7 Rule 14 of C.P.C. But instead, he has filed under Order 8 Rule 14 (3) of C.P.C. and contended that the documents filed are not genuine inspite of which, the learned Trial Court has allowed the petition to receive the said documents. Learned counsel further contended that the documents which are not genuine if marked, may prejudice his rights and therefore prayed to set-aside the order passed by the Trial Court.
4. Perused the record. The Suit is of the year 2019 and PW1 is already examined and at that juncture, the present petition is filed to

receive the documents, which are the original simple Sale Deed and certified copies of Pahanies. Though the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petition is filed under wrong provision of law, it cannot be considered as a ground to reject an application and it does not disentitle the petitioner to gain any relief. However, as far as genuineness of the documents is concerned, that can be looked into during the course of trial. The documents would be received subject to proof, relevancy and admissibility. It is also observed by the Trial Court that it is a original simple Sale Deed that is proposed to be filed along with the certified copies of Pahanies. It is also observed by the Trial Court that the relevancy and genuineness of the documents would be decided during the course of trial. Hence, this Court finds no infirmity in the orders passed by the Trial Court and there is no need to interfere with the said orders.

5. Hence, the Civil Revision Petition is dismissed.

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

SD/- K.BHAVANI SWAMY
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The II Additional Junior Civil Judge, Kollapur.
2. One CC to SRI JAGAN MOHAN REDDY KOTHA, Advocate [OPUC]
3. Two CD Copies

ADK/PSL

HIGH COURT

DATED:26/09/2025

ORDER

CRP.No.3516 of 2025



DISMISSING THE CRP

5
ASV
23/1/16