IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

FRIDAY, THE SIXTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI

CRP.Nos.2338, 2343 AND 2535 OF 2026

CRP NO: 2338 OF 2026

Petition under Article 227 of the constitution of India aggrieved by the Order dated 23.03.2026 Passed in I.A. No.1841 of 2025 in O.S. No.156 of 2017on the file of the court of the Principal Senior Civil Judge, Sangareddy.

Between:

1. Mohammed Aniffa Begum, W/o M.D. Rasheed, aged about 44 years, Occ. Agriculture, R/ o. H.No.1-11/ C, Mansanpalli Village, Kondapur Mandal, Sangareddy District.
2. Shaik Asmath Bee, W/o Late Shaik Mohammed Sab, aged about 62 years, Occ. Housewife, R/o H.No.1-13, Mansanpalli Village, Kondapur Mandal, Sangareddy District.

...Petitioners/Petitioners /Defendant Nos.1 & 2

AND

Shaik Jahangeer Sab, S/o Late Shaik Basheeruddin, aged about 76 years, Occ. Agriculture, R/o. H.No.1-12, Mansanpalli Village, Kondapur Mandal, Sangareddy District.

...Respondent /Respondent/Plaintiff

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026

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 grant stay of further proceedings, including recording of final arguments and pronouncement of judgment, in O.S. No.156 of 2017 pending on the file of the Principal Senior Civil Judge, Sangareddy, pending disposal of the above Civil Revision Petition.

CRP NO: 2343 OF 2026

Petition under Article 227 of the constitution of India aggrieved by the Order dated 23.03.2026 Passed in I.A. No.1842 of 2025 in O.S. No.156 of 2017on the file of the court of the Principal Senior Civil Judge, Sangareddy.

Between:

1. Mohammed Aniffa Begum, W/o M.D. Rasheed, aged about 44 years, Occ. Agriculture, R/o. H.No.1-11/C, Mansanpalli Village, Kondapur Mandal, Sangareddy District.
2. Shaik Asmath Bee, W/o Late Shaik Mohammed Sab, aged about 62 years, Occ. Housewife, R/o H.No.1-13, Mansanpalli Village, Kondapur Mandal, Sangareddy District.

...Petitioners/Petitioners /Defendant Nos.1 & 2

AND

Shaik Jahangeer Sab, S/o Late Shaik Basheeruddin, aged about 76 years, Occ. Agriculture, R/o. H.No.1-12, Mansanpalli Village, Kondapur Mandal, Sangareddy District.

...Respondent /Respondent/Plaintiff

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026

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 all further proceedings, including recording of final arguments and pronouncement of judgment, in O.S. No.156 of 2017 pending on the file of the Principal Senior Civil Judge, Sangareddy, pending disposal of the above Civil Revision Petition.

CRP NO: 2535 OF 2026

Petition under Article 227 of the constitution of India aggrieved by the Order dated 02.07.2026 Passed in I.A. No.1840 of 2025 in O.S. No.156 of 2017 on the file of the court of the Principal Senior Civil Judge, Sangareddy.

Between:

1. Mohammed Aniffa Begum, W/o M.D. Rasheed, aged about 44 years, Occ.Agriculture, R/ o. H.No.1-11/C, Mansanpalli Village, Kondapur Mandal, Sangareddy District.
2. Shaik Asmath Bee, W/o Late Shaik Mohammed Sab, aged about 62 years, Occ. Housewife, R/o. H.No.1-13, Mansanpalli Village, Kondapur Mandal, Sangareddy District.

...Petitioners/Petitioners /Defendant Nos.1 & 2

AND

Shaik Jahangeer Sab, S/o Late Shaik Basheeruddin, aged about 76 years, Occ. Agriculture, R/o. H.No.1-12, Mansanpalli Village, Kondapur Mandal, Sangareddy District.

...Respondent /Respondent/Plaintiff

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026

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 grant stay of further proceedings, including recording of final arguments and pronouncement of judgment, in O.S. No.156 of 2017 pending on the file of the Principal Senior Civil Judge, Sangareddy, pending disposal of the above Civil Revision Petition.

Counsel for the Petitioners in all CRPs : Sri Lohith KONDA representing Sri. B Vamshidhar Reddy

Counsel for the Respondents in all CRPs : No representation

The Court made the following: COMMON ORDER

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE JUVVADI SRIDEVI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION Nos.2338, 2343 & 2535 of 2026
(CNR No.HBHC010521842026)

DATED: 06th NOVEMBER, 2026

BETWEEN:

Mohammed Aniffa Begum and another

...Petitioners

AND

Shaik Jahangeer Sab ...Respondent

COMMON ORDER:

The Civil Revision Petition No.2338 of 2026 is filed by the petitioners-defendant Nos.1 and 2, aggrieved by the order dated 23.03.2026 passed in I.A.No.1841 of 2025 in O.S.No.156 of 2017 by the learned Principal Senior Civil Judge, Sangareddy (hereinafter referred to as 'the learned trial Judge'), whereby the application filed under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, (for short, 'the CPC'), seeking to reopen the evidence of D.W.1 for the purpose of his further chief-examination and marking of certain documents, was dismissed.

02. The Civil Revision Petition No.2343 of 2026 is filed by the petitioners-defendant Nos.1 and 2, aggrieved by the order dated 23.03.2026 passed in I.A.No.1842 of 2025 in O.S.No.156 of 2017 by the learned trial Judge, whereby the application filed under Order XVIII Rule 17 of the CPC, seeking to recall D.W.1 for the

purpose of his further chief-examination to mark two original old pattadar passbooks and two original mutation orders, was dismissed.

03. The Civil Revision Petition No.2535 of 2026 is filed by the petitioners-defendant Nos.1 and 2, aggrieved by the order dated 02.07.2026 passed in I.A.No.1840 of 2025 in O.S.No.156 of 2017 by the learned trial Judge, whereby the application filed under Order VIII Rule 1-A of the CPC, seeking to receive the documents, namely, two original pattadar passbooks and two original mutation orders, pertaining to the respondent therein, was dismissed.

04. Since all the three Civil Revision Petitions arise out of the same suit, involve the same parties and concern the same set of documents and substantially interconnected issues, they are taken up together and are being disposed of by this common order.

05. Heard Sri Lohith Konda, learned counsel representing Sri B. Vamshidhar Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners. Even though notice is served, there is no representation on behalf of the respondent. Perused the material available on record.

06. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the documents sought to be brought on record, namely, two original old pattadar passbooks and two original mutation orders, are essential for proper adjudication of the disputes involved in the suit. It is submitted that the said documents have a direct bearing on the issues that arise for consideration in the suit and that their non-receipt would deprive the petitioners of an opportunity to substantiate their defence. He further submitted that, for the purpose of marking the said documents, it is necessary to reopen the evidence of D.W.1 and recall him for further chief-examination. However, the learned trial Judge, without properly appreciating the relevance and necessity of the documents sought to be produced, dismissed the applications. Therefore, he prayed to set aside the impugned orders and permit the petitioners to produce and mark the subject documents by reopening the evidence and recalling D.W.1.

07. Having regard to the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners and the material available on record, it is apparent that the three applications filed before the learned trial Judge are interrelated and intended to achieve a common purpose, namely, bringing on record two original old pattadar passbooks and two original mutation orders and affording an

opportunity to D.W.1 to speak to the said documents. While I.A.No.1840 of 2025 was filed under Order VIII Rule 1-A of the CPC for receiving the documents, I.A.No.1841 of 2025 was filed under Section 151 of the CPC for reopening the evidence of D.W.1, and I.A.No.1842 of 2025 was filed under Order XVIII Rule 17 of the CPC for recalling D.W.1 for further chief-examination and marking of the documents.

08. In the present case, the petitioners seeks to produce two original old pattadar passbooks and two original mutation orders and to examine D.W.1 further for the purpose of speaking on the said documents. The nature of the documents sought to be produced indicates that they relate to pattadar and mutation entries and, therefore, may have a bearing on the controversy involved in the suit. Their relevance and evidentiary value, however, are matters which the learned trial Judge has to examine at the appropriate stage.

09. In the considered opinion of this Court, the request of the petitioners deserves consideration, particularly having regard to the nature of the documents sought to be produced and the fact that the petitioners are seeking an opportunity to place the same before the learned trial Judge for consideration in the pending suit. If the documents are found to be relevant to the issues

involved in the suit, denying an opportunity to produce them and explain their contents may have a bearing on the effective adjudication of the dispute.

10. Further, no irreparable prejudice would be caused to the respondent if the petitioners are permitted to produce the subject documents and D.W.1 is recalled for the limited purpose of further chief-examination, as the respondent would be entitled to cross-examine D.W.1 with reference to the said documents and to raise all permissible objections regarding their admissibility, proof and evidentiary value. Thus, the interests of the respondent can adequately be protected by granting an opportunity to contest the documents and by imposing appropriate conditions upon the petitioners.

11. It is also relevant to observe that the petitioners cannot be permitted to use the opportunity now sought as a means to fill up lacunae in their evidence or to introduce an entirely new case at a belated stage. The opportunity, therefore, has to be confined strictly to the purpose for which the applications were filed, namely, production of the two original old pattadar passbooks and two original mutation orders and further examination of D.W.1 in relation thereto. The respondent shall be afforded an effective

opportunity to cross-examine D.W.1 and raise all objections available to him in law.

12. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered view that the learned trial Judge ought to have granted an opportunity to the petitioners, subject to appropriate terms and conditions, instead of dismissing the applications. Such an opportunity would facilitate adjudication of the real controversy between the parties and would not cause any undue prejudice to the respondent, particularly when the respondent would have an opportunity to contest the documents and their evidentiary worth. In that view of the matter, the impugned orders are liable to be set aside.

13. Accordingly, with the above observations, all the three Civil Revision Petitions are disposed of, and the impugned orders dated 23.03.2026 passed in I.A.Nos.1841 and 1842 of 2025 and the order dated 02.07.2026 passed in I.A.No.1840 of 2025 in O.S.No.156 of 2017 on the file of the learned Principal Senior Civil Judge, Sangareddy, are hereby set aside. Consequently, I.A.Nos.1840, 1841 and 1842 of 2025 stand allowed. The petitioners are permitted to produce the two original old pattadar passbooks and two original mutation orders before the learned trial Judge. The evidence of D.W.1 shall be reopened and he

shall be recalled for the limited purpose of further chief-examination in relation to the saic documents and their marking, subject to proof and admissibility in accordance with law. The respondent shall be afforded an opportunity to cross-examine D.W.1 with reference to the said documents. It is made clear that the learned trial Judge shall independently consider the objections, if any, raised by the respondent regarding the admissibility, genuineness and evidentiary value of the subject documents, without being influenced by any of the observations made in this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, all the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

SD/- A H S GOWRI SHANKAR,
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal Senior Civil Judge, Sangareddy.
2. One CC to SRI. B VAMSHIDHAR REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
3. Two CD Copies

ADK

OBM

HIGH COURT

DATED: 06/11/2026

COMMON ORDER

CRP.Nos.2338, 2343 AND 2535 OF 2026



DISPOSING OF ALL THE CRPs

WITHOUT COSTS

5
ORy
11-11-26.