



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

[3331]

MONDAY, THE 3rd DAY OF AUGUST 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 1069/2023

Between:

1.INDLA RAMANAMMA, W/O HARI BABU, HINDU, AGED 59 YEARS,
R/O BALI REDDY NAGAR, OLD SINGARAYAKONDA VILLAGE AND
MANDAL, PRAKASAM DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.KANALA SRINIVASULU, S/O NARAYANA, HINDU, AGED ABOUT 46
YEARS, AGRICULTURIST, R/O GANJIVAARI STREET,
SOMARAJUPALLI ROAD, SINGARAYAKONDA VILLAGE AND
MANDAL, PRAKASAM DISTRICT

2.THE MANAGER, ANDHRA BANK, KANDUKUR BRANCH,
KANDUKURU MANDAL, PRAKASAM 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 to set aside the order passed in E.P. No. 71 of 2015 in O.S. NO. 140 of 2014 on 28-11-2022 by the Honourable Senior Civil Judge at Kandukur, issuing fresh warrant of attachment of salary of Judgment Debtor presently called as Chouturi Ramanamma, working as Bank Messenger, Andhra Bank, Kandukur Branch under Order XXI Rule 48 of CPC subject to Section 60 of CPC through Court and RPAD and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2023

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 to

condone the delay of (31) days in filing the above C.R.P. filed against the E.P. No. 71 of 2015 in O.S. NO. 140 of 2014, dated 28-11-2022 on the file of Senior Civil Judge at Kandukur and pass

IA NO: 2 OF 2023

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 to suspend the order issuing a fresh warrant of attachment of salary of Judgment Debtor presently called as Chouturi Ramanamma, working as Bank Messenger, Andhra Bank, Kandukur Branch under Order XXI Rule 48 of CPC subject to Section 60 of CPC through Court and RPAD in E.P. No. 71 of 2015 in O.S. NO. 140 of 2014 dated 28-11-2022 by the Honourable Senior Civil Judge at Kandukur, and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. RAMA CHANDRA RAO GURRAM

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. V BABY RANI

The Court made the following order:

Heard Sri Rama Chandra Rao Gurram, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri D.Praveen Kumar, learned counsel representing Ms. V.Baby Rani, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. Assailing the order dated 28.11.2022 in E.P.No.71 of 2015 in O.S.No.140 of 2014 on the file of the Senior Civil Judge, Kandukur, the above revision petition was filed.

3. The respondent, being the plaintiff, filed O.S.No.140 of 2014 against the revision petitioner for recovery of amount. The said suit was decreed on 18.07.2014. Thereafter, he filed E.P.No.71 of 2015 under Order XXI Rule 48 CPC. The said execution petition was ordered on 28.11.2022. Against the said order, the above revision was filed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the Executing Court failed to appreciate the contention of the petitioner that she is not Indla

Ramanamma. The petitioner's name is Chouturi Ramanamma. The trial Court also failed to consider the documents filed by the petitioner to prove her case.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents supported the order passed by the trial Court.

6. **The point for consideration is:**

Whether the order dated 28.11.2022 in E.P.No.71 of 2015 in O.S.No.140 of 2014 on the file of the Senior Civil Judge, Kandukur, suffers from any illegality warranting interference?

7. As seen from the material available on record, the respondent filed O.S.No.140 of 2014 on the file of the Senior Civil Judge, Kandukur, seeking recovery of amount against the petitioner herein. The suit was decreed on 18.07.2014. Thereafter, the decree holder filed E.P.71 of 2015 under Order XXI Rule 48 CPC. During the inquiry, Exs.A1 to A10 were marked on behalf of the decree holder, and no documents were marked on behalf of the judgment debtor. The Executing Court considered all the contentions of the decree holder and the judgment debtor and eventually allowed the E.P., subject to Section 60 CPC.

8. In fact, the Executing Court considered the contention of the judgment debtor regarding her name being Chouturi Ramanamma but not Indla Ramanamma, and eventually held that the petitioner is also known as Indla Ramanamma.

9. The trial Court exercised jurisdiction vested in it and passed a reasoned order under revision. This Court, while exercising the jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, normally will not act as an appellate Court and substitute its opinion, unless the order under revision suffers from such an illegality. This Court doesn't find any illegality or irregularity in the order dated 28.11.2022 in E.P.No.71 of 2015 in O.S.No.140 of 2014 on the file of the Senior Civil Judge, Kandukur.

10. Accordingly, the civil revision petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

Dated: 03.08.2026
SNI

146

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.1069 of 2023

Dated: 03.08.2026
SNI