

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH :: AMARAVATI

MAIN CASE No: W.P.No.597 of 2007

PROCEEDING SHEET

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
	05.12.2025	<u>RNT, J</u> Heard Sri J.Janaki Rami Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner. No representation for the respondents. 2. The present W.P.No.597 of 2007 was allowed with the following directions on 03.08.2010: (page 14 to 23) “15.Accordingly, the Writ Petition is allowed setting aside the order dated 31.08.2006 passed in D.Dis.No.1775/2004,D-5, directing the parties to establish their rights in Civil Court with regard to their entitlement to claim the properties of Venkatarao. The revenue entries shall remain as it is as existed on the date of death of Venkata Rao. No costs.” 3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that thereafter W.P.M.P.No.34621 of 2010 was filed by the respondents to list the matter under the caption ‘forbeing mentioned’. The said application was filed in October, 2010. On the said application, the matter was being listed on 27.11.2019. The same was dismissed as infructuous by the following order: “Sri Ravi Kumar, the learned counsel submits that he is appearing on behalf of Sri Subba Reddy, the learned counsel for the petitioners. On instructions, he submits that the dispute in the present matter has already been settled and the writ petition has become infructuous. Prayer is allowed. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed	

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		as infructuous. There shall be no order as to costs. As a sequel, the miscellaneous petitions, if any pending shall stand closed." 4. The petitioner has filed I.A.No.1 of 2025 to recall the order dated 27.11.2019. 5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has no knowledge about the order dated 27.11.2019 and when the copy of the said order was filed in the EP, he acquired knowledge. Consequently, this application has been filed. 6. The docket order also shows that on 16.03.2018, a co-ordinate Bench passed the following order: "The case is wrongly posted, as it was already disposed of." 7. In view of the aforesaid, the Court find force in the submission that the writ petition has already been allowed vide order dated 03.08.2010 and the said order was not recalled. Consequently, the writ petition already having been allowed, there was no occasion to dismiss the same as infructuous on 27.11.2019. 8. I.A.No.1 of 2025 is allowed. 9. Order dated 27.11.2019 is recalled, with the result, the order dated 03.08.2010 continues to be in force. <u> </u> RNT,J AG	

