

**IN THE COURT OF FOURTH ADDITIONAL CIVIL JUDGE
(JUNIOR DIVISION): KAKINADA**

Present: Smt. D.Sreedevi,
III Additional Civil Judge (Junior Division), Kakinada.
(FAC) IV Additional Civil Judge (Junior Division), Kakinada.

Monday, this the 06th day of July, 2026.

ORIGINAL SUIT No.604 of 2025.

Between:

Chintakayala Srinu, S/o. Veerabbai, Aged 43 years,
Business, D.no.1-189, Ramalayam Street, Vadapeta,
Vakalapudi, Kakinada Rural, Kakinada

...Plaintiff

AND

Vasamsetti Anjibabu, S/o. Satyam Aged 40 years,
Real Estate, D.no.3-1-52/25, Burma Colony,
Recharlapeta, Kakinada, K.J.C.J.

...Defendant

* * *

This Suit coming on 16.06.2026 for final hearing before me in the presence of *Sri D.Lakshmana Rao*, Advocate for the Plaintiff and the Defendant remained ex-parte and upon hearing arguments, upon considering the material available on record and the matter having stood over for consideration till this day, the Court delivered the following:

JUDGMENT

01. This Suit filed by the Plaintiff against the Defendant to grant a order of Permanent Injunction, restraining the Defendant and his men, his agents, power of attorney holders and his agreement holders from ever interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the Plaintiff over the Plaint schedule property, in any manner whatsoever and award costs of the Suit.

02. **The brief averments of the plaint are as follows:**

(i) The Plaintiff is the absolute owner of the Suit schedule property, and he purchased the plaint schedule property from one Jaldani Veera Venkata

Satyanarayana on 13.03.2023 under the registered Sale deed, bearing doc.no.2358/2023 for a valuable consideration and since then the Plaintiff is in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the Suit schedule property. The Suit schedule property is a vacant site with an extent of 544.44 sq.yards. The Plaintiff further submits that said J.Veera Venkata Satyanarayana purchased the same from one Smt. Inti Satya Mahalakshmi, who acquired the same from her father Repaka Satyanarayana under a Will, dt.02.09.1981.

(ii) The Defendant is also resident of Kakinada, who is said to be doing Real estate Business and he is muscle man and not having respect towards law and order and having evil eye over the Suit schedule property.

(iii) The Plaintiff further submits that as there is an abnormal hike in the prices of lands in an around Kakinada and that the Defendant with an evil plan trying to grab the Suit schedule property without having any manner of right, title, Possession over the Suit schedule property belongs to the Plaintiff. The Defendant is proceeding in highhanded manner and continuously making efforts to trespass into the Suit schedule property even though he is not having any right or title over the Suit schedule property. The Plaintiff with the help of neighbours and relatives would resist the Defendant and his henchmen. On 23.06.2025, the Defendant openly proclaimed that he will come again with some more persons to occupy the Suit schedule property even by bloodshed. If the

Defendant succeeds in his attempts, the Plaintiff will suffer irreparable loss and injury.

(iv) The Plaintiff further submits that the Defendant has no respect towards law and order and he is having influence in political and police circles. The Plaintiff further submits that he will not be able to protect his peaceful possession and enjoyment without obtaining a suitable order of Injunction against the Defendant from the Court restraining the Defendant or his henchmen by way of granting Permanent Injunction.

(v) Therefore, the Plaintiff is constrained to file the Suit to safeguard his rights and possession in the Suit schedule property requesting the Court for Permanent Injunction restraining the Defendant and his henchmen from ever interference with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the Suit schedule property. Hence, the Suit.

03. In this Suit though the Summons were served on Defendant, but the defendant did not appear before the court. The Defendant remained absent without any representation on the date fixed for his appearance. Hence this Court set Defendant as ex parte on 30.07.2025

04. To prove his contention, the Plaintiff himself examined as PW.1 and got marked Ex.A.1 to Ex.A.5. Plaintiff got examined one G.Chittibabu as PW.2.

Ex.A1 is the certified copy of Sale Deed, dt.13.03.2023 in favour of the Plaintiff executed by Jaldani Veera Venkata Satyanarayana, bearing doc.no.2358/2023 of SRO, Pithapuram. Ex.A.2 is the Certified copy of the Sale deed, dt.02.03.2019 in favour of J.Veera Venkata Satyanarayana, executed by Inti Satya Mahalakshmi, bearing doc.no.949/2019 of SRO, Sarpavaram. Ex.A.3 is the Certified copy of registration extract of Sale deed, dt.02.01.1953 in favour of Repaka Satyanarayana, S/o. Buchiraju, executed by Samasala Sathiraju, bearing doc.no.12/1953 of SRO, Kakinada. Ex.A.4 is the notarized copy of unregistered Will, dt.02.09.1981 executed by said Repaka Satyanarayana in favour of Inti Satya Mahalakshmi. Ex.A.5 is the death certificate of said Repaka Satyanarayana, issued by Grama Panchayat authorities, Koripalli, Karapa Mandal.

05. Heard the learned Counsel for Plaintiff and perused the record.

06. Now the point for determination is:

“Whether the Plaintiff is entitled for the relief of the permanent injunction as prayed for”?

07. **Point:** To substantiate his pleadings, the Plaintiff filed his chief-examination affidavit reiterating the material contents of the plaint and examined as PW.1 and marked Ex.A1 to Ex.A5. The said Ex.A1 sale deed discloses that

the the plaintiff i.e. P.W.1 is the absolute owner of the plaint schedule property and he is in the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaint schedule property since the date of execution of Ex.A1 sale deed. The evidence of PW.1 and P.W.2 also shows that the Plaintiff is in the possession of the Plaint schedule property and the Defendant is trying to interfere into the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the Plaintiff over the Plaint schedule property.

08. As the Defendant was remained exparte in the Suit, it can be said that an adverse inference can be drawn against the Defendant to the effect that he has admitted the case of the Plaintiff. The Defendant did not come forward to contest the Suit. The evidence of PW.1 and PW.2 remains un-controverted and unchallenged as the Defendant was set-exparte. Therefore by virtue of the evidence of PW.1 and PW.2 coupled with Ex.A1 to Ex.A5, the Plaintiff has established that he is the absolute owner of the Plaint schedule property and he has been in possession and enjoyment of the Plaint schedule property as on the date of filing of the suit and plaintiff had established that the defendant is trying to interfere into the possession of the plaintiff over the plaint schedule property. Hence the plaintiff is entitled for the relief claimed in the suit.

09. In the result, the Suit is decreed with costs, granting Permanent injunction in favour of the Plaintiff and against the Defendant, restraining the Defendant and his men, his agents, power of attorney holders and his agreement holders

from ever interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the Plaintiff over the Plaint schedule property.

Typed to my dictation to the Stenographer, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court, this the 06th day of July, 2026.

SD/- D.SREEDEVI
III Additional Civil Judge (J.D)
(FAC) IV Additional Civil Judge (J.D),
Kakinada.

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE:-
WITNESSES EXAMINED

For Plaintiff:

PW.1: Chintakayala Srinu
PW.2: Garagala Chittibabu

For Defendant:

-Nil-

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For Plaintiff:

- Ex.A1 : Certified copy of Sale Deed, dt.13.03.2023 in favour of the Plaintiff executed by Jaldani Veera Venkata Satyanarayana, bearing doc.no.2358/2023 of SRO, Pithapuram.
- Ex.A2: Certified copy of the Sale deed, dt.02.03.2019 in favour of Jaldani Veera Venkata Satyanarayana, executed by Inti Satya Mahalakshmi, bearing doc.no.949/2019 of SRO, Sarpavaram.
- Ex.A3: Certified copy of registration extract of Sale deed, dt.02.01.1953 in favour of Repaka Satyanarayana, S/o. Buchiraju, executed by Samasala Sathiraju, bearing doc.no.12/1953 of SRO, Kakinada.
- Ex.A4: Notarized copy of unregistered Will executed by said Repaka Satyanarayana, S/o Buchiraju of Kakinada in favour of Inti Satya Mahalakshmi , dt.02.09.1981.

Ex.A5: Death certificate of said Repaka Satyanarayana, S/o Buchiraju issued by Grama Panchayat authorities, Koripalli, Karapa Mandal.

For Defendant:

-Nil-

SD/- D.SREEDEVI
III Additional Civil Judge (J.D)
(FAC) IV Additional Civil Judge (J.D),
Kakinada.