

APHC010195922026



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

[3299]

THURSDAY, THE 9th DAY OF JULY 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOS: 1144 and 1160/2026

CRP No.1144/2026:

Between:

- 1.KARUMANCHI PRASADA RAO, S/O PEDA VENKAIAH, AGED ABOUT 71 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT.
- 2.KARUMANCHISITAMMA, W/O PRASADA RAO, AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT (DIED)
- 3.KARUMANCHI VENKATESWARA RAO @ BUJJI,, S/O PRASADA RAO, AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT
- 4.KARUMANCHI RAMA RAO, S/O PRASADA RAO, AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. KARUMANCHI GOPAIAHDIED, DIED
2. KARUMANCHI VENKATA RATNAM, S/O LATE GOPAIAH, AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA

MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT

3. KARUMANCHI PRASADA RAO AADAM, S/O LATE GOPAIAH, AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT
4. KARUMANCHI YESUPADAM, S/O LATE GOPAIAH, AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT.
5. MESUPAMU MARIYAMMA, W/O BAKKAIAH, AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS, R/O HARIJANAVADA, VISSANNAPETAVILLAGE AND MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT
6. JUVVANAPUDI KAMALAMMA, W/O RANGARAO, AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS, R/O NEAR CHECK POST, KRISHNA RAO PALEM VILLAGE OF CHATRAI MANDAL, ELURU DISTRICT
7. THOMMANDRU SAROJINI, W/O RANGA RAO, AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS, R/O VATTIGUDIPADU VILLAGE, AGIRIPALLI MANDAL, ELURU DISTRICT

...RESPONDENT(S):

APHC010195272026



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

[3299]

THURSDAY, THE 9th DAY OF JULY 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 1160/2026

Between:

- 1.KARUMANCHI PRASAD RAO, S/O PEDA VENKAIAH, AGED ABOUT 71 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT.
- 2.KARUMANCHI SITAMMA, W/O PRASADA RAO, AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT (DIED)
- 3.KARUMANCHI VENKATESWARA RAO ALIAS BUJJI, S/O PRASADA RAO, AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT
- 4.KARUMANCHI RAMA RAO, S/O PRASADA RAO, AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

- 1.KARUMANCHI GOPAIAH, (DIED)
- 2.KARUMANCHI VENKATA RATNAM, S/O LATE GOPAIAH, AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT
- 3.KARUMANCHI PRASADA RAO ALIAS AADAM, S/O LATE GOPAIAH, AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT
- 4.KARUMANCHI YESUPADAM, S/O LATE GOPAIAH, AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS, R/O TELLADEVARAPALLI VILLAGE, VISSANNAPETA MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT
- 5.MESUPAMU MARIYAMMA, W/O BAKKAIAH, AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS, R/O HARIJANAVADA, VISSANNAPETA VILLAGE AND MANDAL, N.T.R DISTRICT
- 6.JUWANAPUDI KAMALAMMA, W/O RANGARAO, AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS, R/O NEAR CHECK POST, KRISHNA

RAO PALEM VILLAGE OF CHATRAI MANDAL, ELURU DISTRICT

7.THOMMANDRU SAROJINI, W/O RANGA RAO, AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS, R/O VATTIGUDIPADU VILLAGE, AGIRIPALLI MANDAL, ELURU DISTRICT

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1.BASAVARAJU SAI PRANEETH

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

Date of reserved for orders : -----
Date of pronouncement : 09-07-2026
Date of uploading : 17-07-2026

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOS.1144 and 1160 OF 2026

COMMON ORDER:

Heard Sri Basavaraju Sai Praneeth, learned counsel for the petitioners.

2. The respondents are the plaintiffs. They filed the suit in O.S.No.366 of 2006 for permanent injunction, which was dismissed on 23.01.2017 by the learned Principal Junior Civil Judge, Tiruvuru. Challenging the same, the petitioners/respondents filed A.S.No.13 of 2017, which also came to be dismissed for want of prosecution by order dated 12.11.2024. For setting aside the said order, the plaintiffs filed I.A.No.629 of 2025 along with I.A.No.628 of 2025, for condonation of delay of 113 days, which have been allowed by the learned XV Additional District Judge, Krishna District, Nuzvid. Consequently, the appeal has been restored to its original number.

3. Challenging the said orders, the present Civil Revision Petitions under Article 227 of the Constitution have been filed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the suit was filed in the year 2006 and that the petitioners have been running from pillar to post for the last 20 years. He further submits that, once the appeal had been dismissed for want of prosecution, the learned appellate Court ought not to have allowed the application for its restoration.

5. Having considered the aforesaid submission, this Court does not find any substance in such ground or argument. The reason is that the appeal was dismissed for want of prosecution. The appellate court has allowed the applications to set aside that order by condoning the delay and restored the appeal, recording that sufficient cause for the absence on the date was shown. The cause shown was the illness of the appellants. The learned appellate court has believed that cause and for the reasons recorded in the order and also placing reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court cited in the order that liberal approach is to be adopted and as the appeal is a valuable right, has set aside the order of dismissal in default finding the cause to be sufficient.

6. This Court is of the view that the cause shown of illness, is a sufficient cause. No illegality has been committed by the learned trial court in allowing the applications and condoning the delay while setting aside the order of dismissal of the appeal in default. The order impugned advances the cause of justice, giving opportunity of hearing on merits. No prejudice can be said to have been caused as the petitioners will also have such opportunity of hearing before the Appellate Court. This is not a fit case for exercise of the discretionary jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to interfere with the order of learned Court passed exercising discretion in favour of grant of opportunity of hearing.

7. Both the Civil Revision Petitions are dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

RAVI NATH TILHARI, J

Date: 09.07.2026.
Pab

Whether the order is:

Speaking	☒	Reasoned	
Reportable		Non-reportable	☒

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NOS.1144 and 1160 OF 2026

DATE: 09.07.2026

Pab