APHC010053512026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3327]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE 8th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SREENIVASA REDDY

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 433/2026

Between:

1. PATSA SANJEEVA RAO, S/O.LATE NARAYANA RAO, S/O.CHINTA VENKAYYA, 68 YEARS, BUSINESS, JAGANNAPETA, TADEPALLIGUDEM WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

A N D

1. SMT KONDAPALLI VIJAYA KUMARI, W/O.NAGA BALAJI, AGED 51 YEARS. HOUSEWIFE. R/O.D.NO. 19/127/1, MUNSIFF STREET, CHILAKALAPUDI, MACHILIPATNAM, KRISHNA DISTRICT, PRESENTLY CAME DOWN TO TADEPALLIGUDEM, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
2. SMT ADDEPALLI SURYA KUMARI, D/O.LATE NARAYANA RAO, AGED 64 YEARS. BUSINESS, D.NO. 1-3-176/35/4/3, 2ND FLOOR PADMASALI NAGAR COLONY, GANGHI NAGAR, HYDERABAD, TELANGANA STATE.
3. PATSA RANGA BABU, S/O.LATE LAKSHMANA RAO, AGE 55 YEARS. BUSINESS, P.S.NAGAR, BEHIND FOOTBALL PLAYGROUND, MASAB TANK, KHAIRATABAD, HYDERABAD, TELANGANA STATE.
4. PATSA RAMA RAO, S/O.LATE NARAYANA RAO, C/O.APPAJI, AGED 95 YEARS. BUSINESS, FLAT NO.201, MAHADEV FLORA, D.NO.12-11-59, NAMALAGUNDA, OPP COMMUNITY HALL, SECUNDERABAD, TELANGANA STATE.
5. PATSA SUBBA RAO, S/O.LATE NARAYANA RAO, S/O.PATSA VIJAY, AGED 85 YEARS, BUSINESS, SHIKARA PARTMENTS (PENT HOUSE), MEHDIPATNAM, HYDERABAD, TELANGANA STATE.
6. SMT BORRA LAKSHMI TULASAMMA, D/O.LATE NARAYANA RAO AGE 71 YEARS. BUSINESS, NEAR SAI BABA TEMPLE, GULABI THOTA, ELURU, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
7. SMT MOTEPALLI KASI GANGAJALA RATNA KUMARI, D/O.LATE NARAYANA RAO AGED 66 YEARS. BUSINESS, MOTEPALLI VARI STREET, THURPU VEEDHI, ELURU, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
8. PATSA KAMALA SURYA, S/O.LATE LAKSHMANA RAO, AGED 65 YEARS. BUSINESS, P.S.NAGAR, BEHIND FOOTBALL PLAYGROUND, MASAB TANK, KHAIRATABAD, HYDERABAD, TELANGANA STATE
9. SMT PAGADALA PADMAVARI, D/O.LATE LAKSHMANA RAO, AGED 62 YEARS. BUSINESS, P.S.NAGAR, BEHIND FOOTBALL PLAYGROUND, MASAB TANK, KHAIRATABAD, HYDERABAD,

TELANGANA STATE.

10. SMT PATSA KOUSALYA, D/O.LATE LAKSHMANA RAO, AGED 60 YEARS. BUSINESS, P.S.NAGAR, BEHIND FOOTBALL PLAYGROUND, MASAB TANK, KHAIRATABAD, HYDERABAD, TELANGANA STATE.
11. PATSA SATISH, S/O.LATE LAKSHMANA RAO, AGE 57 YEARS, P.S.NAGAR, BEHIND FOOTBALL PLAYGROUND, MASAB TANK, KHAIRATABAD. HYDERABAD, TELANGANA STATE.
12. PATSA VENKATA RAMANA, S/O.SANJEEVA RAO, C/O.CHINTA VENKAYYA, AGED 40 YEARS. BUSINESS, JAGGANNAPETA, TADEPALLIGUDEM, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
13. PATSA NARAYANA RAO, S/O.SANJEEVA RAO, C/O.CHINTA VENKAYYA, AGED 42 YEARS. BUSINESS, JAGGANNAPETA, TADEPALLIGUDEM, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT. (RESPONDENTS 2 TO 13 ARE NOT NECESSARY PARTIES)

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, praying that in the circumstances stated in the grounds filed herein, the High Court may be pleased to the above named Petitioner begs to present this Memorandum of Civil Revision Petition having been aggrieved by the Decree and Order dated 20-03-2025 passed in C.M.A.No.16 of 2024 on the file of Court of the XI Addl. District Judge Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District which was confirmed by the order and decree in I.A.No. 475 of 2022 in OS.No. 15 of 2022 dt.03-08-2024 on the file of Court of the Civil Judge (Senior Division), Tadepalligudem, for the following grounds among other

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

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 Suspend the orders in IA.No.475 of 2022 in OS.No.15 of 2022 on the file of the Court of the Civil Judge (Senior Division), Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District dt:03-08-2024, and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P N MURTHY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. MALLAVOLU NIKITHA

The Court made the following:

O R D E R

This Civil Revision Petition was filed, challenging the Judgment dated 20.03.2025 passed by the learned XI Additional District Judge, West Godavari at Tadepalligudem (for brevity 'the Appellate Court'), in Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No.16 of 2024, whereby and whereunder the learned XI Additional District Judge upheld the Order dated 03.08.2024 passed in I.A.No.475 of 2022 in O.S.No.15 of 2022 by the learned Civil Judge (Senior Division), Tadepalligudem (for brevity 'the trial Court') in an application filed in terms of Order XXXIX Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908.

2. Petitioner herein is 1st appellant in CMA No.16 of 2024 on the file of the Appellate Court, R1 in I.A.No.475 of 2022 and D1 in O.S.No.15 of 2022, on the file of the trial Court. Similarly, 1st respondent herein is R1 in CMA No.16 of 2024, petitioner in I.A.No.475 of 2022, and plaintiff in O.S.No.15 of 2022; R2 and R3 herein are R2 and R3 in CMA No.16 of 2024, R6 and R11 in I.A.No.475 of 2022, and D6 and D11 in O.S.No.15 of 2022; R4 to R13 herein are appellant Nos.2 to 13 in CMA No.16 of 2024, R2 to R5, R7 to R10, R12 and R13 in I.A.No.475 of 2022 and D2 to D5, D7 to D10, D12, and D13 in O.S.No.15 of 2022. Therefore, parties herein are referred to, as they were arrayed in the suit proceedings pending before the trial Court.

3. Plaintiff filed O.S.No.15 of 2022 against the defendant Nos.1 to 13 on the file of the learned Civil Judge (Senior Division), Tadepalligudem seeking the reliefs of declaration of her title over schedule property, and for consequential injunction against the defendants.

4. While the aforesaid suit is pending, plaintiff filed I.A.No.475 of 2022 in O.S.No.15 of 2022 in terms of Section XXXIX Rule 1 of CPC seeking the relief of temporary injunction. The trial Court, after inquiry, *vide* Order dated 03.08.2024 passed in I.A.No.475 of 2022 granted temporary injunction in favour of the plaintiff.

5. Aggrieved of the said Order dated 03.08.2024, C.M.A.No.16 of 2024 was preferred before the learned Appellate Court. The Appellate Court *vide* Judgment dated 20.03.2025, dismissed the C.M.A.No.16 of 2024, confirming the Order dated 03.08.2024 passed in I.A.No.475 of 2022 by the learned Civil Judger (Senior Division), Tadepalligudem. Challenging the *impugned* Judgment dated 20.03.2025, the present Revision Petition came to be filed.

6. Today, when the matter has come up before this Court, learned counsel for the petitioner herein/D1 confined his argument to the extent of disposal of suit in O.S.No.15 of 2022

pending on the file of the learned Civil Judge (Senior Division), Tadepalligudem as expeditiously as possible, for which, learned counsel for 1st respondent/plaintiff reported no objection.

7. A perusal of the material on record goes to show that plaintiff the suit in the year 2022, and the said suit is pending for commencement of trial. Therefore, having regard to the entire facts and circumstances of the case, and also considering the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner herein/ D1, without going into merits of the Revision Petition, this Court directs the learned Civil Judge (Senior Division), Tadepalligudem to dispose of, O.S.No.15 of 2022, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of one (01) year from the date of receipt of copy of this Order.

8. With the above direction, this Civil Revision Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs of the CRP.

Consequently, miscellaneous applications pending if any, shall also stand closed.

JUSTICE K. SREENIVASA REDDY

8th October, 2026.

DNB