

Date of reserved for orders : 03.07.2026
Date of pronouncement : 31.07.2026
Date of uploading : 31.07.2026
APHC010054452026



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI**

FRIDAY, THE 31st DAY OF JULY 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SREENIVASA REDDY

**CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOs. 353 of 2026, 297 of 2026,
355 of 2026, 354 of 2026 and 540 of 2026**

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 353 OF 2026

Between:

1. BANDARU ANANTHA LAKSHMI, W/o. Satya Simha Srinivas, aged about 54 years, R/o. D.No.8-3-228/114/11, Rahmat Nagar, Yousufguda Hyderabad.
2. . Pullepu Veera Venkata Satya Naga Lakshmi,, D/o. Trinadha Babji, aged about 42 years, R/o. D.No.103/2, Near Grama Sachivalayam, Penumarthi Village, Kakinada Rural, East Godavari District.
3. Pullepu Aswini Kumar,, S/o. Trinadha Babji, aged about 40 years, R/o. D.No.103/2, near Grama Sachivalayam, Penumarthi village, Kakinada Rural Mandal, East Godavari District.

...Petitioners

AND

1. NELAPROLU VENKATRAO, (died)
2. Nelaprolu Gopeswaramma, (died)
3. Nelaprolu Ramachandra Rao, S/o. Venkata Rao, aged about 58 years R/o. Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.
4. Nelaprolu Murali Krishna, S/o. Venkata Rao, aged about 48 years, R/o. Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.

5. Nelaprolu Ramanayudu, S/o. Venkata Rao, aged about 44 years, R/o. Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.
 6. Nelaprolu Lakshmana Nayudu, S/o. Venkata Rao, aged about 44 years, R/o. Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.
 7. Kakulapati Lakshmi, W/o. Madhavararao, aged about 60 years, R/o. Darsiparru Village, Pentapadu mandal. West Godavari District.
 8. Mallela Mangatayaru, W/o. Udayabhaskar Rao, aged about 49 years, R/o. Darsiparru Village, Pentapadu Mandalam, West Godavari District.
 9. Nelaprolu Sridevi, D/o. Venkata Rao, aged about 58 years, R/o. Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.
 10. Veerla Siva Nageswara Rao, S/o. Satyanarayana, aged about 52 years, R/o. behind Chaitanya School, K.N.Road, Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.
 11. Kovvuri Bhami Reddy, S/o. Appireddy, aged about 85 years, R/o. 18th Ward, Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.
 12. Kovvuri Nagi Reddy, S/o. Bhami Reddy, aged about 61 years, R/o. D.No.10-2030/1, 18th Ward, Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.
 13. Kovvuri Appireddy, S/o. Bhami Reddy, aged about 56 years, R/o. D.No.10-2030/1, 18th Ward, Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.
- Respondents/ Respondents/DHrs
14. Kaigala Lakshmikantham, (died).
 15. Pullepu Trinadha Babji, (died)
 16. Kaigala Krishnaiah, S/o. Ganganna, aged about 80 years R/o. P and T Colony, Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.
 17. Kaigala Venkata Ganga Prasad, S/o. Krishnaiah, aged about 50 years, R/o. P and T Colony, Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.
 18. Chalamalasetti Naga Lalitha, W/o. Dukeswara Rao, aged about 47 years R/o. Chilakapudi, Machilipatnam, Krishna District.

19. Kaigala Satya Prakash, S/o. Krishnaiah, aged about 44 years, R/o.P and T Colony, Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District. (Respondents 1 to 9 and 14 to 19 are not necessary parties in the above CRP)

...Respondents

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 tobeg to present the above CRP in this Honble Court aggrieved by the Common Order dt15-12-2025 in E.A.No. 233 of 2025 (E.A.No. 233 to 240 of 2025) in E.A.No.114 of 2025 (E.A.No.299 and 300 of 2016 And E.A.No.114 and 115 of 2025) IN E.P.No.65 of 2002 in O.S.No.39 of 1988 on the file of the Court of the Civil Judge (Senior Division), Tadepalligudem, West Godavari District.

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

IA NO: 2 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

Counsel for the Petitioners: Sri DEVALARAJU ANIL KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondents: Sri P RAJASEKHAR Counsel for the Respondents

The Court made the following order:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SREENIVASA REDDY
CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOs. 353 of 2026, 297 of 2026,
355 of 2026, 354 of 2026 and 540 of 2026

COMMON ORDER:

Civil Revision Petition No.353 of 2026 has been filed challenging the Order dated 15.12.2025 passed in E.A.No.233 of 2025 in E.A.No.114 of 2025 in E.P.No.65 of 2002 in O.S.No.39 of 1988 on the file of the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Tadepalligudem.

Civil Revision Petition No.297 of 2026 has been filed challenging the Order dated 15.12.2025 passed in E.A.No.239 of 2025 in E.A.No.300 of 2016 in E.P.No.65 of 2002 in O.S.No.39 of 1988 on the file of the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Tadepalligudem.

Civil Revision Petition No.355 of 2026 has been filed challenging the Order dated 15.12.2025 passed in E.A.No.236 of 2025 in E.A.No.115 of 2025 in E.P.No.65 of 2002 in O.S.No.39 of 1988 on the file of the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Tadepalligudem.

Civil Revision Petition No.540 of 2026 has been filed challenging the Order dated 07.07.2025 passed in E.A.No.114 of 2025 in E.P.No.65 of 2002 in O.S.No.39 of 1988 on the file of the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Tadepalligudem.

Civil Revision Petition No.354 of 2026 has been filed challenging the Order dated 16.12.2025 passed in E.P.No.65 of 2002 in O.S.No.39 of 1988 on the file of the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Tadepalligudem.

2. Petitioners herein are judgment debtors 4, 8 and 9 in E.P.No.65 of 2002 in O.S.No.39 of 1988 before the Court below. Respondents 1 to 13 herein are decree holders, and the respondents 14 to 19 herein are the other judgment debtors, in the said E.P.

3. 1st respondent herein filed O.S.No.39 of 1988 on the file of the Senior Civil Judge, Tadepalligudem against respondents 1 and 2 herein, for specific performance of agreement of sale dated 10.12.1984. During pendency of the said suit, 1st respondent-original plaintiff died, and respondents 2 to 9 herein came on record as his legal representatives. The said suit was decreed vide judgment and decree dated 27.01.1997. Aggrieved

by the said judgment and decree, Appeal Suit No.146 of 1997 was filed on the file of the I Additional District & Sessions Judge, West Godavari at Eluru, and the said appeal was dismissed, vide judgment and decree dated 20.07.2000, confirming the judgment and decree passed by the trial Court. Pursuant to the same, E.P. No.54 of 2002 was filed by the respondents 2 to 9 herein/decree holders for execution of the decree. As the original defendants /judgment debtors 1 and 2 died, the petitioners herein and respondents 16 to 19 herein, were brought on record as their legal representatives as per Order dated 19.06.2024 in E.A.No.101 of 2021. During pendency of the execution proceedings, 2nd respondent herein / 2nd decree holder died, and the proceedings are continued by respondents 3 to 9 herein /decree holders 3 to 9 as her legal representatives, who are already on record.

4. During pendency of the execution proceedings, respondents 10 and 11 filed E.A.Nos.299 of 2016 and 300 of 2016 in the said E.P. seeking to permit them to come on record as decree holders 10 and 11 and for execution of sale deed in their favour, on the strength of a deed of transfer bearing document No.5272 of 2016, dated 01.07.2016 executed by the

original decree holders (respondents 3 to 9 herein) in their favour, and the said petitions were allowed vide Order dated 02.05.2025.

5. Further, during pendency of the execution proceedings, respondents 12 and 13 filed E.A.Nos.114 of 2025 and 115 of 2025 in the said E.P., seeking to permit them to come on record as decree holders 12 and 13 and for execution of sale deed in their favour, on the strength of a deed of transfer bearing document No.391 of 2023, dated 10.01.2023 executed by the respondent No.10/Decree holder No.10, transferring his half share in their favour, and the said petitions were allowed vide Order dated 07.07.2025. The Executing Court, vide its Order dated 16.12.2025, over-ruled the objections raised by the judgment debtors and allowed the Execution Petition No.65 of 2002, directing further steps in the petition.

6. In the aforesaid background-

-the Civil Revision Petition No.353 of 2026 has been filed challenging the Order dated 15.12.2025 passed in E.A.No.233 of 2025 in E.A.No.114 of 2025 in E.P.No.65 of 2002 in O.S.No.39 of 1988, whereby the petition filed by them under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 seeking to condone delay

of 113 days in filing petition to set aside *ex parte* order dated 07.07.2025 passed against them in E.A.No.114 of 2025 and permit them to contest the above proceedings, was dismissed.

-the Civil Revision Petition No.297 of 2026 has been filed challenging the Order dated 15.12.2025 passed in E.A.No.239 of 2025 in E.A.No.300 of 2016 in E.P.No.65 of 2002 in O.S.No.39 of 1988, whereby the petition filed by them under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 seeking to condone delay of 179 days in filing petition to set aside *ex parte* order dated 02.05.2025 passed against them in E.A.No.300 of 2016 and permit them to contest the above proceedings, was dismissed.

-the Civil Revision Petition No.355 of 2026 has been filed challenging the Order dated 15.12.2025 passed in E.A.No.236 of 2025 in E.A.No.115 of 2025 in E.P.No.65 of 2002 in O.S.No.39 of 1988 whereby the petition filed by them under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 seeking to condone delay of 113 days in filing petition to set aside *ex parte* order dated 07.07.2025 passed against them in E.A.No.115 of 2025 and permit them to contest the above proceedings, was dismissed.

-the Civil Revision Petition No.540 of 2026 has been filed challenging the Order dated 07.07.2025 passed in E.A.No.114 of 2025 in E.P.No.65 of 2002 in O.S.No.39 of 1988, whereby the petition filed by respondents 12 and 13 herein, under Order I Rule 10 read with Order XXII Rule 10A and Section 146 CPC, to implead them as decree holders 12 and 13 in the E.P., was allowed.

-Civil Revision Petition No.354 of 2026 has been filed challenging the Order dated 16.12.2025 passed in E.P.No.65 of 2002 in O.S.No.39 of 1988 whereby the Executing Court overruled the objections raised by the judgment debtors and allowed the Execution Petition No.65 of 2002, directing further steps in the petition.

7. Heard both sides.

8. Since these revisions arise out of a common order passed by the Executing Court and as all the petitions arise out of same execution proceedings, at request of both the counsel, these cases are taken up for disposal, by way of this common order.

9. It is the contention of the petitioners that 1st petitioner is resident of Hyderabad whereas petitioners 2 and 3 are residents of Kakinada, and as such, they did not receive any notice in the aforesaid proceedings and they do not have knowledge about the said proceedings, and soon after getting knowledge about the aforesaid proceedings, they filed the respective petitions seeking to condone the delay. As regards the Order dated 07.07.2025 passed in E.A.No.114 of 2025, it is contended that respondents 3 to 9/decree holders 3 to 9 did not file any

document to show that they are the legal representatives of deceased 1st decree holder, and as such, the decree holders 10 to 13 cannot execute the original decree against the judgment debtors basing on the respective transfer deeds executed in their favour.

10. On the other hand, it is the contention of the respondents / decree holders that the petitioners intentionally evaded to receive notices though the notices were sent to the addresses mentioned in the appeal, and that in the appeal vide A.S.No.52 of 2017 on the file of the Principal District Judge, West Godavari at Eluru, the petitioners mentioned that they are residents of Tadepalligudem, and that they did not aver that they never resided in Tadepalligudem, and that the Executing Court rightly ordered substituted service of notice in E.A.Nos.299 of 2016 and 300 of 2016 by way of paper publication on 04.04.2025, and inspite of the same, as there is no appearance on behalf of the petitioners, rightly set them *ex parte*; that the petitioners have not at averred sufficient cause which prevented them from approaching the Court with a petition to set aside the *ex parte* order passed against them, within the period of limitation, and in the absence of the same,

the Executing Court rightly dismissed the E.As. filed seeking to condone the delay.

11. As regards the Order dated 07.07.2025 passed in E.A.No.114 of 2025 in the E.P., he submitted that the Executing Court rightly permitted the petitioners therein to come on record as decree holders 12 and 13 pursuant to the registered of transfer in their favour bearing document No.391 of 2023, dated 10.01.2023 executed by the respondent No.10/Decree holder No.10, and there is no infirmity. On this aspect, learned counsel for the respondents relied on a decision rendered by a learned single Judge of this Court in *Narreddula Veera Reddy v. Vannem Venkateswarlu and others*¹, wherein it is held that Order XXI Rule 16 CPC enables the transferee of decree to get the decree executed and for such execution, no express permission from the execution Court is required, and as per the said provision, a notice to the transferor / decree holder and the judgment debtor about the execution application filed by the transferee is required calling for their objections and decide on the objections, if any, raised, and no separate application is

¹ 2025 SCC OnLine AP 3379

required and the execution Court can take such steps on the execution petition itself.

He further submitted that the trial Court rightly over-ruled the objections of the judgment debtors and allowed the E.P., directing further steps, vide Order dated 16.12.2025, which is impugned in C.R.P.No.354 of 2026, and that the suit is of the year 1988 and the E.P. is of the year 2002, and the judgment debtors successfully dragged on the E.P. proceedings for 24 years, inspite of being unsuccessful in the trial Court as well as the appellate Court. Hence, he prays to dismiss the CRPs.

12. These CRPs are preferred under Section 115 CPC. Under Section 115 CPC, under three circumstances, this Court can exercise its revisional jurisdiction, namely – when subordinate court appears -to have exercised a jurisdiction not vested in it by law; or to have failed to exercise a jurisdiction so vested; or to have acted in the exercise of its jurisdiction illegally or with material irregularity.

13. A perusal of the material on record goes to show that O.S.No.39 of 1988 on the file of the Civil Judge (Senior Division), Tadepalligudem was filed by 1st respondent herein,

against respondents 1 and 2 herein, for specific performance of agreement of sale dated 10.12.1984. As 1st respondent/original plaintiff died during pendency of the suit, respondents 2 to 9 herein came on record as his legal representatives. The trial Court decreed the said suit on 27.01.1997, and appeal vide A.S.No.146 of 1997 on the file of the I Additional District & Sessions Judge, West Godavari at Eluru, preferred against the said judgment and decree, was dismissed on 20.07.2000. E.P. No.54 of 2002 came to be filed by the respondents 2 to 9 herein / decree holders for execution of the decree. The petitioners herein and respondents 16 to 19 herein, were brought on record as the legal representatives of the deceased original defendants / judgment debtors 1 and 2, as per Order dated 19.06.2024 in E.A.No.101 of 2021. During pendency of the execution proceedings, 2nd respondent herein/2nd decree holder died, and the proceedings are continued by respondents 3 to 9 herein /decree holders 3 to 9 as her legal representatives, who are already on record.

14. During pendency of the execution proceedings, respondent Nos.10 and 11 filed E.A.Nos.299 of 2016 and 300 of 2016, stating that a registered deed of transfer bearing document

No.5272 of 2016, dated 01.07.2016 was executed by the original decree holders (respondents 3 to 9 herein) in their favour for a valuable consideration and prayed to permit them to subrogate in the recovery rights of the said decree holders and permit them to come on record as decree holders 10 and 11. In the said petitions, the petitioners, who are judgment debtors 4, 8 and 9, did not choose to make appearance, and accordingly, a substitute service of notice by way of paper publication on 04.04.2025 was issued, and inspite of the same, as they failed to make their appearance, they were set *ex parte* and further steps followed in the said petitions, vide Order dated 02.05.2025. Seeking to condone delay of 179 days in filing an application to set aside *ex parte* order dated 02.05.2025 passed in E.A.No.300 of 2016, the petitioners filed E.A.No.239 of 2025. It is their case that they did not receive any notice from the Court in the said E.A.No.300 of 2016, and as such, they could not appear before the Court to contest the matter by filing counter. The said application was dismissed vide the impugned order in CRP No.297 of 2026.

15. Further, during pendency of the execution proceedings, respondent Nos.12 and 13 filed E.A.Nos.114 of 2025 and 115 of

2025, stating that a registered deed of transfer bearing document No.391 of 2023, dated 10.01.2023 executed by the respondent No.10/Decree holder No.10, transferring his half share in their favour, for a valuable consideration, and prayed to permit them to come on record as respondents 12 and 13 / decree holders 12 and 13 in the E.P. and to permit them to execute the decree passed against judgment debtors 1 and 2 pursuant to the aforesaid transfer deed. In the said petitions, the petitioners, who are judgment debtors 4, 8 and 9, did not choose to make appearance, and as such, they were set *ex parte* and further steps followed in the said petitions, vide Order dated 07.07.2025. Seeking to condone delay of 113 days in filing an application to set aside *ex parte* order dated 07.07.2025 passed in E.A.Nos.114 of 2025 and 115 of 2025, the petitioners filed E.A.Nos.233 of 2025 and 236 of 2025. It is their case that they did not receive any notice from the Court in the said E.A.Nos. 114 of 2025 and 115 of 2025, and as such, they could not appear before the Court to contest the matter by filing counter. As the said applications were dismissed vide the impugned common order, CRP Nos.353 of 2026 and 355 of 2026 came to be filed.

16. The contention of the petitioners is that 1st petitioner is resident of Hyderabad and the petitioners 2 and 3 are residents of Kakinada, and that they were not served with any notices in the present proceedings before the Executing Court and that they do not have knowledge about the present proceedings. A perusal of the material on record goes to show that in A.S.No.52 of 2017 on the file of the Principal District Judge, West Godavari at Eluru, preferred by petitioners 2 and 3 herein on 21.04.2015, against the judgment and decree passed in O.S.No.187 of 2007 on the file of the Senior Civil Judge, Tadepalligudem, they showed their addresses as residents of D.No.4-35-11, Mahalakshmi Nagar, Tadepalligudem. The subject applications E.A.Nos.299 of 2016 and 300 of 2016 were preferred during the same period i.e. in the year 2016. In spite of sending notices in the said petitions, the petitioners evaded to receive the same. Similarly, in E.A.Nos.114 of 2025 and 115 of 2025 also, they evaded to receive the notices. In view of the same, substitute service of notice was ordered by way of paper publication in local daily newspaper Prajasakthi, and in spite of the same, as they did not make their appearance, they were set *ex parte* and further steps followed in the said E.As. It is also

pertinent to note that 1st petitioner/judgment debtor No.4 filed her counter in E.P. vide S.R.No.5543, dated 17.10.2025 and remained *ex parte* in E.As., whereas the other petitioners remained *ex parte* both in E.P. and the E.As.

17. Further, a perusal of the respective affidavits filed in support of E.A.Nos.233 of 2025, 239 of 2025 and 236 of 2025, no cause, much less sufficient cause, is shown in order to condone the delay in filing the respective petitions to set aside the *ex parte* orders. Having fully aware of the execution proceedings, the petitions appear to have been filed only to further drag on the execution proceedings. Therefore, considering these aspects, the Executing Court rightly held that there is sufficient service of notice on the petitioners, and in spite of the same and having well aware of the execution proceedings, they did not make their appearance, and this is only to delay and drag on the execution proceedings. There is no infirmity or perversity. Accordingly, CRP Nos. 297 of 2026, 353 of 2026 and 355 of 2026 are devoid of merits.

18. As regards CRP No.540 of 2026, which challenges the Order dated 07.07.2025 passed in E.A.No.114 of 2025 in the

E.P., whereby petition filed by respondents 12 and 13 under Order I Rule 10 read with Order XXII Rule 10A and Section 146 CPC, to implead them as decree holders 12 and 13 in the E.P. was allowed, is concerned, the Executing Court rightly permitted them to come on record as decree holders 12 and 13 pursuant to a registered deed of transfer in their favour bearing document No.391 of 2023, dated 10.01.2023 executed by the respondent No.10/Decree holder No.10. Being transferees under the transfer deed, they are entitled to subrogate in the recovery rights of the original decree holders and can come on record as decree holders in the E.P. Admittedly, respondent No.10/ decree holder No.10 was impleaded as decree holder pursuant to a deed of transfer bearing document No.5272 of 2016, dated 01.07.2016 executed by the original decree holders (respondents 3 to 9 herein) in his favour and in favour of respondent No.11/decreed holder No.11, as per the Order dated 02.05.2025 passed by the Executing Court in E.A.Nos.299 of 2016 and 300 of 2016. Therefore, there is no infirmity in passing the Order dated 07.07.2025 in E.A.No.114 of 2025, and CRP No.540 of 2026 is devoid of merits.

19. As regards CRP No.354 of 2026, which challenges the Order dated 16.12.2025 passed in E.P. No.65 of 2022 in O.S.No.39 of 1988, whereby Executing Court over-ruled the objections raised by the judgment debtors and allowed the Execution Petition No.65 of 2002, directing further steps in the petition, is concerned, a perusal of the material on record goes to show that judgment debtors 3 to 9 were added as legal representatives of the original judgment debtors, as per Order dated 19.06.2024 in E.A.No.101 of 2021. The objection taken by the judgment debtors 4, 5 to 9 is that there was a stay of eviction of deceased judgment debtors 1 and 2 from the schedule property, granted by this Court in W.P.No.24574 of 2004. The Executing Court over-ruled the said objection stating that the said Writ Petition was dismissed on 18.3.2008. Considering the material on record, the Executing Court rightly over-ruled the objections and rightly allowed the Execution Petition, vide Order dated 16.12.2025, directing to take further steps for execution of the sale deed. There is no infirmity and CRP No.354 of 2026 is devoid of merits.

20. The Hon'ble Apex Court, in a recent decision dated 06.03.2025 in *Periyammal (Dead) through LRs and ors v V.*

Rajamani and anr. (Civil Appeal Nos. 3640-3642 of 2025), while reiterating the directions contained in paragraph No.42 of the earlier judgment in *Rahul S. Shah v Jinendra Kumar Gandhi* reported in (2021) 6 SCC 418, categorically directed *inter alia* all the High Courts to issue an administrative Order or Circular, directing their respective district judiciary to ensure that the Execution Petitions pending in various courts shall be decided and disposed of, within a period of six months without fail. Pursuant to the same, the High Court, on the administrative side issued Circular No. 04 of 2025 vide ROC No. 208/SO/2025, dated 28.04.2025, directing the district judiciary to ensure that execution petitions pending shall be decided and disposed of within a period of six months without fail. In the case on hand, the suit is of the year 1988 and the E.P. is of the year 2002. Suit was decreed on 27.1.1997 and the appeal preferred against the decree was dismissed on 20.07.2000. More than 26 years has elapsed after dismissal of the First Appeal. The Execution Petition has been pending for the last 24 years. The petitioners/judgment debtors successfully dragged on the proceedings. Therefore, the Executing Court is directed to complete the E.P. proceedings pursuant to the aforesaid

directions of the Hon'ble Apex Court and the Circular instructions of this Court, expeditiously.

21. With the aforesaid directions, the Civil Revision Petitions are dismissed.

As a sequel thereto, the miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this Civil Revision Petitions shall stand closed.

JUSTICE K. SREENIVASA REDDY

31 .07.2026
DRK

Whether the order is :

Speaking Yes/No / Reasoned Yes/No
Reportable Yes/No / Non-Reportable Yes/No

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SREENIVASA REDDY

COMMON ORDER

IN

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOs. 353 of 2026, 297 of 2026,
355 of 2026, 354 of 2026 and 540 of 2026

31.7.2026

DRK

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI
CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOs. 353 of 2026, 297 of 2026,
355 of 2026, 354 of 2026 and 540 of 2026

Between:

Bandaru Anantha Lakshmi & others

..PETITIONERS

AND

Nelaprolu Venkat Rao (died) by LRs & others

...Respondents

DATE OF ORDER PRONOUNCED : 31.07.2026

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL :

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K. SREENIVASA REDDY

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers
may be allowed to see the Order? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether the copy of Order may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? | Yes/No |
| 3. Whether His Lordship wish to see the
fair copy of the Order? | Yes/No |

JUSTICE K.SREENIVASA REDDY

*** HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K.SREENIVASA REDDY**

**+ CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOS. 353 of 2026, 297 of 2026,
355 of 2026, 354 of 2026 and 540 of 2026**

% 31.07.2026

Between:

Bandaru Anantha Lakshmi & others

..PETITIONERS

AND

Nelaprolu Venkat Rao (died) by LRs & others

...Respondents

! Counsel for the petitioners : Sri Devalaraju Anil Kumar

^ Counsel for the respondents : Sri P.Rajasekhar

< Gist:

> Head Note:

? Cases referred:

1)2025 SCC OnLine AP 3379

2) Judgment dated 06.03.2025 in *Periyammal (Dead) through LRs and ors v V. Rajamani and anr. (Civil Appeal Nos. 3640-3642 of 2025)*