



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

[3331]

THURSDAY, THE 16th DAY OF JULY 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 1269/2026

Between:

1. TALACHEERU PRAMEELAMMA, W/O. LATE ARUNA PRASADA RAO, HINDU, AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS. PERMANENT R/O. NAVURUPALLI VILLAGE AND POST, PODALAKUR MANDAL, SPSR NELLORE DISTRICT. PRESENTLY R/O. FLAT NO. 304, AKRUTHI NIVAS, SATYA SAI SUPER MARKET UPSTAIRS, 4TH LINE, CZECH COLONY, HYDERABAD.
2. SRI. TALACHEERU RAGHAVENDRA RAO,, S/O. LATE ARUNA PRASAD RAO, AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS, OCC. BUSINESS, PERMANENT R/O. NAVURUPALLI VILLAGE AND POST, PODALAKUR MANDAL, SPSR NELLORE DISTRICT. PRESENTLY R/O. FLAT NO. 304, AKRUTHI NIVAS, SATYA SAI SUPER MARKET UPSTAIRS, 4TH LINE, CZECH COLONY, HYDERABAD.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. SMT BOBBA SARADA, W/O. SRINIVASULU REDDY, HINDU, AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS, R/O. NARASINGARAOPET, WEST GUDUR, GUDUR TOWN AND MANDAL, SPSR NELLORE DISTRICT.
2. TALACHEERU ARUNA PRASADA RAO, (DIED) D-1
3. NUTHETI RADHIKA, W/O. KRISHNA MOHAN, HINDU, AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS, R/O. NAVURUPALLI VILLAGE AND POST, PODALAKUR MANDAL, SPSR NELLORE DISTRICT. (RESPONDENTS 2 AND 3 ARE NOT NECESSARY PARTY TO THE PRESENT PETITION)

...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 Docket Order dated 15-04-2026 passed in O.S. No. 47/2017, on the file of Hon'ble VII Additional District Judge, Gudur, having allowed receiving document petition in I.A.No. 205/2026 in O.S.No. 47/2017 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 dispense with filing of Certified Copy of Docket Order dated 15-04-2026 in O.S. No. 47/2017, on the file of the Hon'ble VII Additional District Judge, Gudur in filing the above CRP However E-court services online copy is filed herewith, otherwise the petitioner will suffer irreparable loss and hardship and pass

IA NO: 2 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 O.S. No. 47/2017 on the file of the Hon'ble VII Additional District Judge, Gudur, pending disposal of the present civil revision petition and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1.K PALLAVI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.G JAGADEESWAR

The Court made the following:

ORDER

Heard Smt. K. Pallavi, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Raja Reddy, learned counsel representing Sri G. Jagadeeswar, learned counsel for respondent No.1.

2. Defendants 2 and 4 filed the above revision challenging the docket order, dated 15.04.2026 in O.S.No.47 of 2017 on the file of the learned VII Additional District Judge, Gudur.

3. For the sake of convenience, the parties to the revision are referred to as per their status in the suit.

4. The plaintiff instituted suit O.S.No.47 of 2017, originally against the deceased defendant No.1, for recovery of money on the strength of promissory notes, dated 12.08.2014 and 14.08.2014. The plaintiff pleaded that the deceased defendant No.1 executed promissory notes originally in favour of one Pokala Kishore Kumar, S/o Venkateswarlu, who in turn transferred the promissory notes in favour of the plaintiff for consideration by making transfer endorsements on the reverse side of the promissory notes. Therefore, the plaintiff became a holder in due course. Since defendant No.1 failed to repay the amount despite several requests, the plaintiff got issued a legal notice, dated 19.05.2017 and instituted the above suit.

5. Defendant No.1 filed a written statement. It was contended, inter alia, that he never executed the suit promissory notes and those notes were fabricated and forged. The son of the defendant No.1 was doing real estate business and one Gattamaneni Arun Kumar used to look after his son's accounts. Disputes arose between the son of defendant No.1 and Arun Kumar. Thereafter, said Arun Kumar projected several persons and instituted civil and criminal cases against defendant No.1 and his family members.

6. Thereafter, defendant No.1 died, and his legal representatives were brought on record as defendants 2 to 4. Defendants 2 and 4 filed a written statement, with similar averments to that of the written statement of defendant No.1.

7. Pending the suit, defendants 2 and 4 filed I.A.No.205 of 2026 under Order VIII Rule 1(3) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 ('C.P.C.') to receive certain documents. The said application was allowed on 13.04.2026. Thereafter, defendant No.4 was examined as D.W.1 and an independent witness was examined as D.W.2. When the documents filed along with I.A.No.205 of 2026 were sought to be marked in evidence, the trial court, by a docket order dated 15.04.2026, declined to mark the same on the ground that they are not relevant to the suit transaction. Aggrieved by the same, the present revision is filed.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that having received the documents in I.A.No.205 of 2026, the Court below should have allowed them to be exhibited.

9. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No.1 would submit that those documents are irrelevant and hence, the trial Court rightly denied to mark the said documents.

10. The point for consideration is :

Whether the order, docket order, dated 15.04.2026 in O.S.No.47 of 2017 on the file of the learned VII Additional District Judge, Gudur, suffers from any illegality or perversity, warranting interference of this Court?

11. As seen from the material available on record, the plaintiff instituted suit O.S.No.47 of 2017 for recovery of amount on the strength of promissory notes said to have been executed by deceased defendant No.1 in favour of Sri Pokala Kishore Kumar. The contention of the plaintiff is that the promissory notes were transferred for consideration and she is the holder in due course.

12. In fact, in the written statement, the deceased defendant No.1 denied execution of the promissory notes and contended about the disputes between G. Arun Kumar and his son. In that scenario, the documents filed along with I.A.No.205 of 2026 i.e. registered sale deeds are nothing to do with the suit transaction. The trial court, in the opinion of this court, has rightly held that the said documents are not relevant to decide the issues in the present suit. This Court finds no illegality or perversity in the docket order passed by the trial court.

13. Given the above discussion, the docket order does not warrant any interference of this Court. Hence, the revision is liable to be dismissed.

14. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed without costs.

Since the suit is of the year 2017, the learned trial Court shall expedite disposal of the suit, in view of the circular issued by this Court vide R.O.C.No.560/OP/CELL/ 2022, dated 23.11.2022, strictly in accordance with law.

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

JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

Date: 16.07.2026

IKN

Whether the order is :

Speaking Yes/No / Reasoned Yes/No

Reportable Yes/No / Non-Reportable Yes/No