



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

[3333]

FRIDAY, THE 24th DAY OF JULY 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOS: 1803 AND 1911 OF 2026

Between:

1. BATHA SIMHACHALAM, , S/O LATE NARASANNAIDU, AGED ABOUT
65 YEARS, OCCULTIVATION, R/O MAIN STRET,
KONDACHAKARAPALLI VILLAGE,
VANGARAMANDALAM, SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT, ADHAR
NO.781065549631.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. BANTU SATYAM, , S/O LATE POLL NAIDU, AGED 73 YRS., OCC-
CULTIVATION, R/OD.NO.2-99, GOLLADI VILLAGE, BADANGI M,
VIZIANAGARAM DISTRICT.

2. BATHA CHANDRA SEKHAR, , S/O SIMHACHALAM, AGED 39YRS.,
INDIAN, UNEMPLOYEE, R/O D.NO.1-143, KONDACHAKARAPALLI
VILLAGE, VANGARA M, SRIKAKULAM 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 The Honble Court may be pleased to direct the learned executing court to consider the re-submission points, in unnumbered claim petition in E.A.No. of 2026 in E.P. No. 8/2024 in O.S. No.7/2021 dated 27-04-2026 on the file of the learned Senior Civil Judge,

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

may be pleased to stay all further proceedings in E.P.No.8/2024 in O.S.No.7/2021 on the file of Senior Civil Judge, Rajam, and pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. ALLADI RADHAKRISHNA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 1911/2026

Between:

1. BATHA SIMHACHALAM,, S/O LATE NARASANNAIDU, AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS, OCC. CULTIVATION, R/O MAIN STRET, KONDACHAKARAPALLI VILLAGE, VANGARA MANDALAM, SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT, ADHAR NO. 781065549631

...PETITIONER

AND

1. BELLANA ADINARAYANA, S/O LATE CHINNAYYA, AGED 54 YRS., INDIAN, CULTIVATION, R/O D.NO.5-100, PARADHI VILLAGE, BADANGI (M), VIZIANAGARAM DISTRICT.

2. BATHA CHANDRA SEKHAR, S/O SIMHACHALAM, AGED 45 YRS., INDIAN, BUSINESS, R/O D.NO.1-143, KONDACHAKARAPALLI VILLAGE, VANGARA (M), SRIKAKULAM 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 direct the learned executing court to consider the re-submission points, in unnumbered claim petition in E.A.No. of 2026 in E.P. No. 10/2024 in O.S. No. 9/2021 dated 27-04-2026 on the file of the learned Senior Civil Judge, Rajam and dispose of the matter on merits, 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 to stay all further proceedings in E.P.No.10/2024 in O.S.No.9/2021 on the file of Senior Civil Judge, Rajam, and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.ALLADI RADHAKRISHNA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE V.SUJATHA
CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOS: 1803 AND 1911 OF 2026

COMMON ORDER:

Since the issue involved and the parties in both the Civil Revision Petitions are one and the same, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of both the matters by way of the following common order:

2. C.R.P. Nos.1803 and 1911 of 2026 have been preferred against the return endorsements dated 27.04.2026 in the unnumbered E.As. of 2026 in E.P.Nos.8 and 10 of 2024 in O.S.Nos.7 and 10 of 2021, respectively, on the file of the learned Senior Civil Judge, Rajam.

3. According to the petitioners, the Court below returned the claim applications without properly examining the documents filed in support of their claim and raised certain objections. It is further contended that the claim applications were returned on two occasions, namely, on 08.04.2026 and again on 27.04.2026, on the ground that there was a discrepancy between the schedule of property described in the claim petitions and that mentioned in the execution petitions. The Court below also observed that the petitioners had failed to produce any document establishing that the properties described in both the schedules are one and the same. Aggrieved by the said return endorsements, the present Civil Revision Petitions have been filed.

4. Today, when the matters were taken up for hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that he is ready and willing to comply with the objections raised by the Court below. However, he submitted that such

compliance can be made only after the original petitions, which are presently pending before this Court, are returned to him.

5. Recording the said submission, these Civil Revision Petitions are closed. The Registry is directed to return the original petitions to the learned counsel for the petitioners to enable him to comply with the objections raised by the Court below and to represent the matters before the competent Court in accordance with law. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

Date:24.07.2026

KA

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOS: 1803 AND 1911 OF 2026

Date:24.07.2026

KA