APHC010616232026

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH**
**AT AMARAVATI [3330]**
**(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

FRIDAY, THE 20th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO**

**CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 3346/2026**

**Between:**

1. BASIREDDY RAJESWARA REDDY, S/O. VEERA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS, BUSINESS,R/O. SRI SAI RAJESWARI COLONY, KOTHAPALLI PANCHAYATH PRODDUTUR MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.

**...PETITIONER**

**AND**

1. JANAPATI RAMA GOPAL, S/O. SINGARAPPA, AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS, BUSINESS, RESIDING AT FLAT NO. 102,WHITE LOTUS APARTMENT, YMR COLONY,PRODDUTUR TOWN MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.

**...RESPONDENT**

Petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India/ Section 115 of CPC ,praying that in the circumstances stated in the grounds filed herein,the High Court may be pleased tomay be pleased to allow the Civil Revision Petition and setting aside the Order Dt.02.11.2026 in I.A.No. 492 of 2023 in O.S.No. 14 of 2020 on the file of court of the II Additional District Judge, Kadapa at Proddatur. and pass such .

**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 may be pleased to stay all further proceedings including appearance in

C.C.No.4166 OF 2025 on the file of V Additional Judicial Magistrate, Nellore, pending disposal of the petition and pass such

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1. M RAVINDRA

**Counsel for the Respondent:**

1. V NITESH

**CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 3349/2026**

**Between:**

1. BASIREDDY RAJESWARA REDDY, S/O. VEERA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS. BUSINESS,R/O. SRI SAI RAJESWARI COLONY, KOTHAPALLI PANCHAYATH PRODDUTUR MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.

**...PETITIONER**

**AND**

1. JANAPATI RAMA GOPAL, S/O. SINGARAPPA, AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS, BUSINESS, RESIDING AT FLAT NO. 102,WHITE LOTUS APARTMENT, YMR COLONY,PRODDUTUR TOWN MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT

**...RESPONDENT**

Petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India/ Section 115 of CPC ,praying that in the circumstances stated in the grounds filed herein,the High Court may be pleased toFor the reasons stated above, it is prayed that the Honble Court maybe pleased to allow the Civil Revision Petition and setting aside the Order Dt.02.11.2026 in I.A.No. 487 of 2023 in O.S.No. 10 of 2021 on the file of court of the II Additional District Judge, Kadapa at Proddatur. and pass such other order or orders as this Honble Court deems fit and proper in the interests of justice and equity.

**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 stay all further proceedings in O.S.No. 10 of 2021 on the file of court of the II Additional District Judge, Kadapa at Proddatur, pending disposal of the civil revision petition

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1. M RAVINDRA

**Counsel for the Respondent:**

1. V NITESH

**The Court made the following:**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO**

**CIVIL REVISION PETITION Nos.3346 and 3349 OF 2026**

**COMMON ORDER:**

Since the parties in both the Civil Revision Petitions are same, these two cases are taken up together and are being disposed of by way of this common order.

2. These Civil Revision Petitions are filed challenging the orders even dated 02.11.2026 passed in I.A.No.492 of 2023 in O.S.No.14 of 2020 and in I.A.No.487 of 2023 in O.S.No.10 of 2021 on the file of learned Second Additional District Judge, Kadapa.

3. Heard Sri M.Ravindra, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri V.Nitesh, learned counsel for the respondent.

4. In both cases, the respondent/plaintiff instituted two suits O.S.No.14 of 2020 and O.S.No.10 of 2021 on the file of learned Second Additional District Judge, Kadapa, seeking recovery of money based on promissory notes. The petitioner/defendant filed I.A.No.492 of 2023 in O.S.No.14 of 2020 and I.A.No.487 of 2023 in O.S.No.10 of 2021 under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, seeking consolidation of both the suits for conducting common and joint trial, recording evidence for better appreciation and resolving the disputes and pronounce common judgment in the interest of justice.

5. However, learned trial Court dismissed the Interlocutory Applications in both suits observing that to balance justice perfectly, the cases should not be merged, but they should be heard together on the very same days. This keeps the evidence clean and separate, but ensures the cases progress at the exact same speed.

6. This Court is not inclined to cite the judgments relied upon by the respective learned counsel. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for both parties and the reasons assigned by the learned trial Court, this Court is of the view that orders of the learned trial Court does not warrant any interference.

7. Therefore, both Civil Revision Petitions are disposed of at the admission stage, directing the learned trial Court to dispose of both suits simultaneously, as observed by the learned trial Court, to balance justice. The learned trial Court is directed to examine witnesses together on the very same day separately and simultaneously. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

**JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO**

Date: 20.11.2026

**KBN**

**113**

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO**

**CIVIL REVISION PETITION Nos.3346 and 3349 of 2026**

**Date: 20.11.2026**

***KBN***