



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

[3299]

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 1152/2026

Between:

1.KANAKALA SUMANT, S/O KRISHNA, AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, OCC
BUSINESS, R/O D.NO. 10-4-70, STREET NO. 10, SUNDAR NAGAR,
DAIRY FARM, VISAKHAPATNAM, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.ASMA FARHA, W/O SYED ABDUL HAMEED, AGED ABOUT 58
YEARS. REPRESENTED BY HER GPA HOLDER SYED ABDUL
HAMEED, S/O LATE S.A.SATTAR, AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS, R/O
D.NO. 21-52-26, OPP. CHRIST CHURCH, CHANGALARAOPETA,
VISAKHAPATNAM, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.

2.SYED MOHAMMAD RAYYAN, S/O ABDUL HAMEED, AGED ABOUT
36 YEARS, R/O D.NO. 21-52-26, OPP. CHRIST CHURCH,
CHANGALARAOPETA, VISAKHAPATNAM, VISAKHAPATNAM
DISTRICT

3.SYED ABDUL SATTAR, S/O ABDUL HAMEED, AGED ABOUT 35
YEARS, R/O D.NO. 21-52-26, OPP. CHRIST CHURCH,
CHANGALARAOPETA, VISAKHAPATNAM, VISAKHAPATNAM
DISTRICT

4.SYED MOHAMMAD FOUZAN, S/O ABDUL HAMEED, AGED ABOUT
32 YEARS, R/O D.NO. 21-52-26, OPP. CHRIST CHURCH,
CHANGALARAOPETA, VISAKHAPATNAM, VISAKHAPATNAM
DISTRICT

5.SAQUI ZURRA, W/O MOHAMMED JAHANGIR, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCC. HOUSEWIFE, R/O D.NO. 12-11-69, 2ND FLOOR, WARASIGUDA, NEAR MUMTA HOTEL, SECUNDERABAD-500061, TELANGANA STATE, REPRESENTED BY HER FATHER GPA HOLDER SYED ABDUL HAMEED, S/O LATE S.A.SATTAR, AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,R/O D.NO. 21-52-26, OPP. CHRIST CHURCH,CHANGALARAOPETA, VISAKHAPATNAM, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.

6.GOTTIMUKKALA VENKATA UMA DEEPIKA, W/O C.RAMARAJU, OCC. HOUSEWIFE, R/O FLAT NO.205, KIRLAMPUDI AREA. BESIDE MEGALAYA HOTEL, OPP. NUT COLLEGE, ASILMETTA, C.B.M. COMPOUND, VISAKHAPATNAM-500016 (RESPONDENT NO. 6 IS NOT NECESSARY PARTY IN THE PRESENT C.R.P)

...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 set aside the order dated 04.11.2025 made in I.A.No.613 of 2024 in O.S.No.577 of 2016, pending on the file of XII dditional District Judge, Visakhapatnam (Erstwhile East Godavari) and allow the Interlocutory applications 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 grant stay all further proceedings in O.S.No.577 of 2016, pending on the file of XII Additional District Judge, Visakhapatnam, Visakhapatnam District disposal of the above CRP and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.A K KISHORE REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI**CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 1152 of 2026****JUDGMENT:**

The plaintiffs, who are the respondent Nos.1 to 5 filed a suit for specific performance of contract against the present respondent No.6, based on an agreement of sale in respect of the plaint schedule property. Subsequently, the plaintiffs filed an application under Order I Rule 10 read with Section 151 of C.P.C., seeking to implead the present petitioner as defendant No.2, on the ground that the petitioner has purchased part of the property from the present 6th respondent subject matter of the agreement of sale. The said application has been allowed and the trial Court directed the impleadment of the present petitioner as defendant No.2 in the suit. Challenging the said order, the present petition has been filed.

2. Heard Sri K. Tarun Ganesh Reddy, learned counsel representing Sri A.K. Kishore Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not disputed that the petitioner/defendant No.2 has purchased part of the property the subject matter of the agreement for sale, for which suit has been filed for specific performance by the 1st respondent/plaintiff. He submits that the application could not be allowed for the reason that he has not purchased the entire property and also that the plaintiffs did not file any application seeking impleadment of the other purchasers, who are also said to be the necessary parties to the suit.

4. So far as the present controversy is concerned, in view of the impugned order relating to the impleadment of the present petitioner as defendant No.2 in the suit, there is no dispute that 2nd defendant had purchased part of the property the subject matter of the agreement of sale, in respect of which the suit for specific performance of contract has been filed and is pending.

5. This Court does not find any legality in the impugned order. The submission that there are some other purchasers of the property under the agreement of sale and that the plaintiffs have not filed any application for their impleadment, cannot be a ground so as to reject the application with respect to a particular purchaser. It is for the plaintiffs, to have filed the application with respect to those other purchasers, if any, as submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner. But on the ground that any such application has not been filed, the application filed in respect to the petitioner, did not deserve rejection. The same has rightly been allowed.

6. I find no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order.

7. The Civil Revision Petition is dismissed.

8. No order as to costs.

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

RAVI NATH TILHARI,J

Dated:24.04.2026
KNN

241

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 1152 of 2026

Dated:24.04.2026
KNN