

APVZ010000032026



**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL CIVIL JUDGE (SENIOR DIVISION)  
VIZIANAGARAM**

**Present : Sri N. Ramesh Naidu**  
Principal Civil Judge (Senior Division), Vizianagaram.

Thursday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2026

**H.M.O.P.No.3/2026**

|    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. | Potupureddi Satyam Naidu, S/o.Atchim Naiud, aged about 33 years, Hindu, Main road, Attada village, Jami Mandal, Vizianagaram District, Aadhar No.6098 9172 4362.                                                                                          |                |
| 2. | Smt.Potupureddi Yerni Kotalaxmi @ Mataka Yerni Kotalaxmi, W/o.Potupureddi Satyam Naidu, D/o.Mataka Rama Krishna, aged 26 years, Hindu, Residing at Door No.1-91, Main Road, Attada Village, Jami Mandal, Vizianagaram District, Aadhar No.6632 7743 3133. | ...Petitioners |
| Vs |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                |
|    | <b>NIL</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | ...Respondent  |

This petition coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Sri P.Dhanunjaya Rao, Advocate for the petitioners and the matter having heard and stood over for consideration till this day, this court made the following.

**:O R D E R:**

1. The petitioned couple claims a decree of divorce by mutual consent under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955.
2. The case of duo petitioners in a nutshell is that their marriage has been solemnized on 21.08.2021 at Attada village, Jami Mandal, Vizianagaram District, according to Hindu rites and rituals, duly following the customary

practices and traditions. Soon after the marriage, both of them put up matrimonial nest at 21.08.2021 at Attada village, Jami Mandal, Vizianagaram District, where their marriage was consummated. Both of them led hassle free conjugal life for three months. They were unblessed with children during their wedlock. Thereafter, there arose between them some disputes on account of misunderstandings. All efforts of elders and well-wishers for their reunion went futile. Consequent thereupon, both of them have been living separately without any conjugal bliss. Subsequently, both of them having realized impossibility of reunion, reached a settlement to have a decree of divorce by mutual consent and in pursuance of such decision, the second amongst them has agreed to relinquish all her rights, including maintenance and permanent alimony against the first amongst them. Both of them agreed not to file any cases, either civil or criminal or matrimonial against one another in future and left with a liberty to remarry persons of their choice. Both of them have undertaken not to interfere in the lives of one another. Hence, the case on hand came to be filed to have a decree of divorce by mutual consent.

3. Both the petitioners have presented the petition on 08.12.2025 for divorce by mutual consent and the directory period of six months was elapsed by 07.06.2026. In spite of counseling, the petitioned spouses are determined to have divorce by mutual consent by giving little wiggle room for reunion. Therefore, the estranged spouses are allowed to adduce their evidence in proof of the averments of their divorce OP, and pursuant to it, the estranged spouses having been examined as PW1 and PW2, got marked on their behalf Exs.A1 to A4.

4. Heard the duo petitioners and perused the record.

5. Now the points that arise for determination in the petition are:

*1. Whether there has been any marriage solemnized between the duo petitioners? If so, whether the duo petitioners are unable to*

*adjust to live together and have mutually agreed that their marriage should be dissolved?*

*2. Whether the circumstances of case warrant a decree of divorce by mutual consent?*

**6. Point No.1:**

The specific case of duo petitioners is that their marriage has been solemnized on 21.08.2021 at Attada village, Jami Mandal, Vizianagaram District, according to Hindu rites and rituals and soon after the marriage, both of them put up matrimonial nest at 21.08.2021 at Attada village, Jami Mandal, Vizianagaram District, where their marriage was consummated and both of them led hassle free conjugal life for three months and thereafter, there arose between them some disputes on account of misunderstandings, and even after intervention of elders for amicable settlement, neither there was any improvement, nor there was any possibility of reunion, as such they are living separately for more than four years and eventually, they have realized impossibility of reunion and decided to obtain a decree of divorce by mutual consent.

7. The duo petitioners, in order to prove the factum of their marriage, have been examined as P.W.1 and P.W.2, both of whom have reiterated and reaffirmed once again the averments of the petition they have filed for divorce by mutual consent and reasserted to have been married on 21.08.2021 at Attada village, Jami Mandal, Vizianagaram District, as per Hindu rites and rituals, following the traditions and customary practices.

8. Both the petitioners as P.W.1 and P.W.2 have produced the wedding card under the cover of Ex.A1, the contents there under the wedding card drives to suggest that both the petitioners invited their relatives and friends for their marriage that was slated to be held on 21.08.2021 at Attada village, Jami Mandal, Vizianagaram District. In addition to that, they have produced their combined photograph together with certificate of Gazetted officer, under the

cover of Ex.A2 whereunder they are certified to be as wife and husband. Besides, they have also produced under the cover of Exs.A3 and A4 the photocopies of Aadhar Cards, which establishes the identity of duo petitioners.

**9.** Thus, the ocular evidence of duo petitioners as P.Ws.1 and 2 coupled with the contents of Exs.A1 and A.2 drives this Court to arrive at an irresistible conclusion that the marriage of duo petitioners had been performed on 21.08.2021 at Attada village, Jami Mandal, Vizianagaram District, following Hindu traditions and customary practices.

**10.** Now the subsidiary point that falls for consideration is whether or not the duo petitioners are unable to adjust to live together and have mutually agreed that their marriage should be dissolved. Both the petitioners, while being examined as PW1 and PW2 have also categorically deposed to have been living separately for more than four years due to irreconcilable disputes, and despite the matter was placed before elders for amicable settlement, the petitioned spouses are unable to rejoin together, as such the spouses are advised to sever the matrimonial ties. The evidence of PW1 and PW2 strikes confidence of the Court to arrive at a conclusion that had not there been quarrels of such a magnitude, the petitioned spouses must not have approached the Court of Law to have a decree of divorce by way of mutual consent after having deliberations and suggestions from the elders. Thus, it appears from the evidence and the attendant circumstances of the case that the petitioned spouses have been living separately for more than four years preceding presentation of petition for divorce by mutual consent, without any conjugal bliss and that they have not been able to adjust to live together and that they have mutually agreed that their marriage should be dissolved. The first point is thus answered in the affirmative.

**11. Point No.2:**

My findings and observations made under the first point establishes the one fact that the petitioned spouses have mutually agreed to part ways

after realizing the impossibility of reunion. When the matrimonial relationship between the petitioned spouses was unworkable, expecting the petitioned spouses to rejoin in the matrimonial nest yields no result, nothing but flogging a dead horse. The duo petitioners thus appear to have crossed the rubicon to have a decree of divorce by mutual consent and pursuant to it, the second amongst them has agreed to relinquish all her rights including maintenance and permanent alimony against the first amongst them. Both of them agreed not to file any cases, either civil or criminal or matrimonial against one another in future and left with a liberty to remarry persons of their choice. Both of them have undertaken not to interfere in the lives of one another. Thus, the duo petitioners are found to have duly worked out equities for obtaining divorce. So, in order to put quietus to the long standing bickering of the petitioned spouses, this Court sincerely feels it appropriate to dissolve the marriage of petitioned spouses by way of decree of divorce by mutual consent, which in its turn would relieve the petitioned spouses from the pain and sufferance they have undergone during the marital voyage. The circumstances of case, thus warrant a decree of divorce by mutual consent. The second point is answered accordingly.

**12.** In the result, the petition claiming for divorce has been allowed, declaring that the marriage of estranged spouses solemnized on 21.08.2021 has been dissolved henceforth by mutual consent.

Typed to my dictation to the Stenographer Gr-II(on deputation), corrected and Pronounced by me in Open Court, this the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2026.

*Sd/-N.Ramesh Naidu*

Prl. Civil Judge (Senior Division)  
Vizianagaram.

#### **APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE** **Witnesses Examined**

**For Petitioners:**

PW1 : Potupureddi Satyam Naidu

PW2 : Smt.Potupureddi Yerni Kotalaxmi

@ Mataka Yerni Kotalaxmi,

**For Respondent:**

--- NONE ---

**Documents Marked**

**For Petitioners:**

Ex.A1 : Wedding Card.

Ex.A2 : Combined photograph of petitioners

Ex.A3 : Photocopy of Aadhar card of witness/P.1 (Compared with original).

Ex.A4 : Photocopy of Aadhar card of witness/P.2 (Compared with original).

**For Respondent:**

-- NIL --

*Sd/-N.Ramesh Naidu*

Prl. Civil Judge (Senior Division)  
Vizianagaram.