



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3233]

FRIDAY, THE 7th DAY OF AUGUST 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B KRISHNA MOHAN

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 559/2026

Between:

- 1.V RAJA SEKHAR, S/O. V.S.HARINATH BABU, AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
- 2.V.KIRAN KUMAR,, S/O. V.S.HARINATH BABU, AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS. BOTH ARE RESIDING AT D.NO. 537, BAIRAGIPATTEDA, TIRUPATHI TOWN AND DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

- 1.V CHENCHU REDDY, S/O. V.NARAYANA REDDY, R/AT. D.NO. 3-81,1. THUMMALAGUNTA, TIRUPATHI DISTRICT.
- 2.V S HARANATH BABU, S/O. LATE UPPU SIDDIAIAH CHETTY, D.NO. 537, BAIRAGIPATTEDA, TIRUPATHI TOWN AND DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India,praying that in the circumstances stated in the grounds filed herein,the High Court may be pleased topleased to allow the C.R.P. by setting aside the decretal order and decree dt.12-9-2025 passed in I.A.No.67 of 2025 in O.S.No.273 of 2018 on the file of the X Additional District Judge, Tirupati in the interest of justice and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased pleased to stay all further proceedings in O.S.No.273 of 2018 on the file of

the X Additional District Judge, Tirupati, till the disposal of the C.R.P. in the interest of justice and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1.P VENKATA RAMA SARMA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.HARINATH REDDY SOMA

The Court made the following Order:

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned counsel appearing for the 1st respondent.

2. This revision is filed against the order in I.A.No.67 of 2025 in O.S.No.273 of 2018 dated 12.09.2025.

3. The petitioners herein are the defendants 2 and 3 in the suit. The 1st respondent herein is the plaintiff in the suit. The 2nd respondent herein is the 1st defendant in the suit.

4. The suit was instituted for declaration of title and possession over the suit schedule properties. Initially the defendants/petitioners herein filed written statement in the above said suit. Thereafter, they felt that there shall be some additional information to be brought on record by way of an additional written statement, for which, they approached their advocate on record to file additional written statement. However, for one reason or the other, it appears that the learned Advocate postponed the event and ultimately, as he suffered with the paralysis, he could not file the same, in time. Thereby some delay occurred and thereafter, changing of the counsel on record in the trial Court, the petitioners herein/defendants therein filed the above said additional written statement before the trial Court in I.A.No.67 of 2025 in O.S.No.273 of 2018 on the file of X Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tirupati. The trial Court

dismissed the same stating that there is a delay of 6 years in filing the additional written statement after the institution of the suit.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners herein are not going back from the original averments made in the written statement submitted already. By way of filing an additional written statement, the additional facts are sought to be brought on record by explaining the delay in the averments of the additional written statement. For which, necessary permission was sought before the trial Court in the interest of justice so as to have the complete pleadings on record from their side. The delay also has been occurred as the petitioners/ defendants are residing outside India.

6. These reasons ought to have been taken note of by the trial Court while dealing with the above said I.A. and ought to have allowed the I.A. in the interest of justice. When the additional written statement is permitted to be filed, at the same time, the plaintiffs shall also be given an opportunity to file reply/rejoinder for the same, if so, required and if so warranted.

7. For the above said reasons, the order of the trial Court in the above said I.A.No.67 of 2025 in O.S.No.273 of 2018 dated 12.09.2025 is set aside herewith, by permitting the petitioners to submit the additional written statement on payment of costs of Rs.10,000/- to the plaintiff within a period of two (02) weeks from the date of receipt of this order. Upon filing proof of payment of the said costs before the trial Court, the same shall be permitted to be placed on record. On receiving the additional written statement, the

plaintiff shall also be given an opportunity to file any reply/rejoinder for the same in a reasonable time. Accordingly, the suit shall be proceeded with in accordance with law.

8. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is disposed of. Interim order if any deemed to have been vacated. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, Interlocutory Applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE B. KRISHNA MOHAN

07.08.2026
PGT