IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT: HYDERABAD

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K. LAKSHMAN

CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.2968 OF 2026
(CNR No.HBHC010651762026)

Date: 09.10.2026

Between:

Mrs. D. Venkatalakshmi & another .. Petitioners

Vs

Mrs. Kuldeep Kaur & others .. Respondents

This Court made the following:

ORDER:

Heard Mr. K. Mohan, learned counsel for the petitioners.

2. This Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article - 227 of the Constitution of India, assailing the docket order dated 17.08.2026 in O.S. No.912 of 2021 passed by learned III Additional Junior Civil Judge-cum-III Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Kushaiguda.

3. The petitioners herein are plaintiffs in O.S. No.912 of 2021, while the respondents are defendants. The petitioners filed the said

suit against the respondents seeking declaration of title, declaring the sale deed as null and void and for recovery of possession.

4. It is the specific contention of learned counsel for the petitioners that learned trial Court while passing docket order dated 17.08.2026, made certain remarks against the counsel appearing for the plaintiffs to the following effect:

> "During the call work, matter is passed over for hearing on I.A. No.213 of 2026, it has been observed by this court that counsel for plaintiff since many adjournments after matter has been passed over would not appear before the court, he simply requested to pass over matter, thereafter he will not appear before the court and filed memos and petitions during the call work without serving the notice to other side, in view of above observations it is strictly directed to counsel for plaintiff to appear before the court whenever matter is called after call work, if not further steps will follows…."

5. Referring to the aforesaid order, learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that during most of the previous

adjournments, learned trial Court reported both counsel present and nowhere it was recorded the plaintiffs' counsel was absent. On 07.09.2026 during call work learned trial Court adjourned the matter to 21.12.2026 without conducting any proceedings though the case is a part-heard matter and petitioner No.1 is a senior citizen. Thus, making the aforesaid remarks against the counsel appearing for the plaintiffs in the aforesaid suit is unwarranted and improper, particularly in the absence of any material on record substantiating such allegations. Therefore, he sought to set-aside such adverse remarks.

6. In view of the aforesaid specific contention of learned counsel for the petitioners, *vide* order dated 24.09.2026, this Court directed the Registry to call for the original record in O.S. No.912 of 2021 from the trial Court. This Court received the original record and perused the same.

7. Perusal of record would reveal that when the aforesaid suit was coming up for cross-examination of PW.1, on 12.03.2026, the petitioners filed an application *vide* I.A. No.213 of 2026 under Order -

VII, Rule - 14 (3) of the CPC, to receive death certificate dated 12.09.2012 Gift Settlement Deed dated 18.04.1995 by granting leave stating that the husband of petitioner No.1 had executed a Gift Settlement Deed in favour of her daughter, namely Ms. D. Veera Venkateshwari and it bears the original signature of her husband. It is her specific allegation that the sale deed bearing document No.411 of 2000, dated 10.03.2000 said to have executed by her husband in favour of respondent No.1. The said document is forged one and she is also taking steps for sending the said document to FSL. Perusal of record would also reveal that accordingly she filed I.A. No.454 of 2026 on 23.06.2026 under Section - 45 of the Indian Evidence Act, with a request to send the said sale deed for comparison with the admitted signature of her husband in the said Gift Deed, to FSL. Both the said applications are pending and the same are posted to 21.12.2026.

8. Perusal of record would also reveal that on 15.07.2025 when the aforesaid suit was called, it was represented by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners herein - plaintiffs that PW.1

(petitioner No.1 herein) is old age lady and she cannot move out of the house and accordingly posted the matter to 01.08.2025 for marking the documents. As per the docket sheet of the trial Court in O.S. No.912 of 2021, on most of previous adjournments, both counsel present as rightly contended by learned counsel for the petitioners herein.

9. In the light of the above, it is apt to note that Bench and the Bar have a shared responsibility to uphold the dignity and decorum of the judicial process.

10. As contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that at present petitioner No.1 herein is aged about 82 and, therefore, she is a super senior citizen. The suit is of the year 2021 and it is for declaration. It is also apt to note that the year “1999” was observed as “International Year of Older Persons”. In view of the “National Policy for Older Persons” adopted by the Government of India, the erstwhile High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad issued a Circular vide ROC.No.4790/1999/OP Cell-E, dated 02.11.1999 directing all the Judicial Officers in the State to identify and dispose

of matters in which persons above “65 years” of age are involved, on priority basis. Subsequently, erstwhile the High Court of Andhra Pradesh issued Circulars vide ROC.No.3465/E-1/2003, dated 05.12.2003, ROC.No.1230/OP Cell-E/2005, dated 20.08.2005 and ROC.No.3465/E-1/2003, dated 14.12.2011 and the High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad for the States of Telangana and Andhra Pradesh vide Circular in ROC.No.5226/OP Cell-E/2014, dated 20.12.2014, in which specific instructions are issued to give priority to the cases relating to senior citizens for the expeditious disposal. In the light of the same, notice to the respondents herein is waived of by invoking power of this Court under Article - 227 of the Constitution of India.

11. Therefore, without entering into the merits and demerits of the case, the docket order dated 17.08.2026 in O.S. No.912 of 2021 passed by learned III Additional Junior Civil Judge-cum-III Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class at Kushaiguda, is set aside only to the extent of adverse remarks made against learned counsel for the plaintiffs. However, learned trial Court is directed to dispose of I.A.

Nos.213 of 2026 and 454 of 2026 in O.S. No.912 of 2021 and the suit in O.S. No.912 of 2021 as well strictly in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

12. The present Civil Revision Petition is accordingly disposed of. In the circumstances of the case, there shall be no order as to costs.

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

K. LAKSHMAN, J

9th October, 2026.

Note:

The Registry is directed to return the original record in O.S. No.912 of 2021 to the trial Court under due acknowledgment.

(B/O.) Mgr