

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH :: AMARAVATI

MAIN CASE No: C.M.S.A.No.25 of 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
1.	23.04.2026	<u>VS,J</u> <u>C.M.S.A.No.25 of 2026</u> Notice before admission. Learned counsel for the petitioners/appellants is permitted to take out personal notice on the respondents by registered post with acknowledgement due and file proof of service in the Registry by the next date of hearing. <u>VS,J</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2026</u> The present second appeal has been preferred, aggrieved by the judgment and decree dated 01.12.2025 passed in A.S.No.117 of 2019. Brief facts of the case are as follows: The appellants has initially filed I.P.No.17 of 2010 before the learned Additional Civil Judge's Court (Senior Division), Chittoor seeking adjudication of respondents No.1 and 2/appellants herein as insolvents and for annulment of three registered sale deed dates 07.11.2009, 11.01.2010 and 12.01.2020 executed by respondents No.1 and 2 in favour of	

	respondents No.3 to 6 and to declare the same as null and void. After due adjudication, the trial Court allowed I.P.No.17 of 2010, declaring respondents No.1 and 2 as insolvents and further directing that the Official Receiver shall manage the properties in accordance with the provisions of the Provincial of Insolvency Act, 1920. Aggrieved thereby, respondents No.3 to 6 preferred A.S.No.117 of 2019 on the file of the I Additional District Judge, Chittoor District at Chittoor, wherein the first appellate Court, vide judgment and decree dated 01.12.2025, reversed the decree passed in I.P.No.17 of 2010, holding that no evidence was adduced by the petitioners to establish that, apart from the properties covered under the said deeds, there were no other properties standing in the name of respondents No.1 and 2, either individually or jointly. It is submitted that respondents No.3 to 6, in pursuance of the order passed by the first appellate court, are making hectic attempts to encumber and alienate the I.P. schedule property by taking advantage of the said order. In the event they succeed in alienating the property, the appellants would be put to great hardship and irreparable injury, and it would result in multiplicity of proceedings. As rightly contended by the learned counsel the appellants, if the I.P. schedule property is further alienated by respondents	
--	--	--

	No.3 to 6 in favour of third parties, it would lead to multiplicity of proceedings. In view of the above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant ad-interim injunction restraining the respondents No.3 to 6/respondents No.1 to 4 herein from alienating or encumbering the I.P. schedule properties till the next date of hearing. Post the matter on 19.06.2026. _____ VS,J KGR	
--	---	--