

**IN THE COURT OF THE CHAIRMAN, LRAT-CUM-II ADDITIONAL
DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, RANGA REDDY DISTRICT
AT L.B.NAGAR**

PRESENT: Smt.Chiranji Ashalatha
Chairman, LRAT-cum-
II Addl. District & Sessions Judge
R.R.District at L.B.Nagar.

Tuesday, this the 17th day of July, 2026

I.A.NO.509 OF 2025

IN

O.S.NO.764 OF 2019

BETWEEN:

Gurram Prameela

...Petitioner/Plaintiff

AND

Smt. Yerrabelli Vimala and others

... Respondents/Defendants

This petition is coming up before me on 07.07.2026 for final hearing in the presence of **Sri Thakur G Karan Singh**, learned counsel for the petitioner and **Sri Sricharan Telaprolu**, learned counsel for respondent no.1, 10, 12 and 13, **Sri Suri Sravan Kumar**, learned counsel for respondent no.2 and **Sri L.Harish**, learned counsel for respondent no.3 and upon perusing the entire material on record, upon hearing the arguments on either side and after having stood over for consideration, till this day, this Court made the following:

:: O R D E R ::

1. This is a petition filed u/o XXII Rule 3 r/w section 151 of CPC to permit the petitioner/plaintiff no.2 to continue as surviving plaintiff and wife of deceased plaintiff no.1 by causing an entry to that effect.
2. The petitioner/plaintiff no.2's case is as follows: (i) She along with her late husband filed the above suit for declaration of title and consequential injunction in respect of suit schedule "A" and "B" properties situated at Gurramguda Village, Balapur Mandal. During the pendency of

the above case the plaintiff no.1 died on 21.07.2023 due to post Covid complications. After the death of her husband, she went into depression and she was under medication, therefore she could not be able to meet new advocate nor proceeded further in the above case. If she is not permitted to proceed further, an irreparable loss and injury will be caused to her which cannot be compensated by any other means. Hence, this petition.

3(i). The respondent no.1, 10, 12 and 13 filed counter as follows: The petition filed by the plaintiff no.2 is barred by limitation. The present petition is filed after an abnormal and inordinate delay of 487 days. The petitioner has neither disclosed the exact number of days of delay nor offered any legally acceptable or sufficient cause for condoning such extraordinary delay. A bald allegation of being "in depression and under medication" is not sufficient cause unless supported by material evidence such as medical prescriptions, doctor's certificates. The signature appearing on the affidavit does not match her earlier signatures filed in the suit and it seems that the application is not filed by herself. This clear discrepancy raises serious doubt regarding the authenticity of the affidavit and its contents. Therefore, it is prayed to dismiss the petition with costs.

3(ii). The respondent no.2 filed counter as follows: There is no valid and justifiable reason and that the petitioner/plaintiff did not file any medical certificate to substantiate her contention. The counsel for respondents/defendant no.1, 10, 12 and 13 represented about the death

of first plaintiff more than one year ago. The petitioner/plaintiff no.2 counsel was present but he has not reported anything in this regard. It clearly shows that petitioner/plaintiff no.2 did not evince any interest to pursue the matter and filed the petition at the belated stage by mentioning health reason of depression and medication without any medical certificate to crave sympathy from this court.

3(iii). The respondent no.3 filed counter as follows: The petitioner/plaintiff no.2 is claiming to acquire ownership over the suit schedule B property by way of adverse possession. The plaintiff was never in possession of said plots in suit survey number. No plausible reason is shown for the delay. Who are the legal heirs that required to come on record is not reflecting in the petition. The petition is devoid of merits and liable to be dismissed.

4. I have heard both sides and perused material on record.

5. Now the point for determination is: ***Whether the petitioner is entitled to seek the relief as sought for?***

6. **POINT:** The death of the plaintiff no.1 on 21.07.2023 is not denied. The petitioner is wife of the deceased plaintiff no.1. The petitioner contends that her husband died due to post Covid complications and after his death, she went to depression and could not able to meet her advocate to proceed with the suit, therefore the delay in filing the petition to permit her to represent her deceased husband in the present suit. The death of a husband causes deep emotional pain and trauma for almost every wife, though everyone feels and handles grief in their own unique

way. Depression and sadness do not always show up in a medical file. The delay of 487 days is not a considerable delay, however the petitioner is also a party to the present suit and further in view of the nature of the suit and rival contentions of the parties, this court inclined to condone the delay as sought for. Accordingly, the petition is answered in favour of petitioner and against the defendants.

7. In the result, the petition is allowed subject to payment of costs of Rs.1,000/- on or before next date of hearing, failing which the petition shall stand dismissed. For compliance call on 07.08.2026.

(Typed to my dictation by the stenographer, after correction, pronounced by me in the open court on this the 21st day of July, 2026).

-Sd/XXXXXXX

**II ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE
R.R.DISTRICT AT L.B.NAGAR**

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE
WITNESSES EXAMINED

FOR PETITIONERS:

None

FOR RESPONDENTS:

None

EXHIBITS MARKED

FOR PETITIONER:

NIL

FOR RESPONDENTS:

NIL

-Sd/XXXXXXX

**II ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE
R.R.DISTRICT AT L.B.NAGAR**