IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE MOUSHUMI BHATTACHARYA

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO.2412 OF 2026
(CNR NO.HBHC010539972026)

DATE: 08.10.2026

BETWEEN:

Abdul Aleem

...Petitioner

AND

M. Papi Reddy and Another

...Respondents

Ms. Y. Sonanjali, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

ORDER:

1. The Civil Revision Petition has been filed against the Docket Order dated 16.04.2026 passed by the learned Senior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District at Kukatpally, allowing I.A. No.849 of 2025 in O.S.No.1225 of 2022 filed by the respondents/plaintiffs for receiving certain documents filed by them after the filing of the Suit.

2. The Trial Court allowed the application on the ground that the plaintiffs should be given an opportunity to produce

their evidence in the present case, as they had recently obtained the documents.

3. The respondent No.1/plaintiff No.1 refused service of notice and the respondent No.2/plaintiff No.2 was issued notice, which was delivered on 09.09.2026. However, the respondent No.2/one of the plaintiffs is not represented.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioner/defendant has made her submissions.

5. According to counsel, the affidavit filed by the plaintiffs does not state any reasons as to why these documents were sought to be brought on record 3 years after the filing of the Suit.

6. Counsel further submits that the plaintiffs do not mention any of the 10 documents. However, considering the reasons given by the Trial Court particularly that the genuineness, proof, relevancy and admissibility of the documents have not been decided at this stage and that the Court is only receiving the said documents while leaving the same to be decided at Trial and this constitutes sufficient reasons for allowing the receipt of the documents.

7. The impugned Docket Order makes it clear that the I.A. is being allowed only to the extent of the receipt of documents for the purpose of giving an opportunity to the plaintiffs to produce their evidence.

8. The Trial Court has also given the ground that the plaintiffs have recently obtained the above documents and the Court is satisfied with the grounds stated for taking the documents on record.

9. The affidavit filed by the plaintiffs states that they have recently collected the certified copies of the documents from the concerned authorities and that the documents are required to establish the plaintiffs' title and possession in relation to the suit schedule property.

10. Hence, this Court does not find any error in the impugned Docket Order.

11. As stated above, the relevancy and admissibility of the documents are duly to be decided by the Trial Court at the time of the Trial.

12. *Mekala Sanjeeva Reddy and Two Others v. Smt. Dindu Chandrakala and Six Others*, an order passed by this Court on

21.08.2026 in CRP No. 2517 of 2026, was on different facts; in any event, the defendant in that case sought to bring 14 documents on record after the commencement of Trial.

13. Hence, this Court does not find any scope for interference in the impugned Docket Order dated 16.04.2026.

14. Moreover, the contention of counsel appearing for the petitioner that the defendant did not get an opportunity to respond to the additional documents is belied by the impugned Docket Order itself, which clearly records that the respondent/defendant filed a counter to the plaintiffs' I.A.

15. CRP No.2412 of 2026, along with all connected applications, is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

MOUSHUMI BHATTACHARYA, J

DATE: 08.10.2026
NDS

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE MOUSHUMI BHATTACHARYA

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO.2412 OF 2026
(CNR NO.HBHC010539972026)

DATE: 08.10.2026

NDS