



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

[3524]

**TUESDAY ,THE SIXTH DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

APPEAL SUIT NO: 229/2025

Between:

Venumbaka Ramana Reddy

...APPELLANT

AND

Karreyeddula Audi Seshaiah and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Appellant:

1.P V RAGHU RAM

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

The Court made the following:

Interim order: *(per Ravi Nath Tilhari,J)*

Heard learned counsel for the appellant.

2. The appellant is the plaintiff. He filed suit for declaration of title and for injunction against the defendants/respondents. The suit has been dismissed. Learned Court has recorded the finding that the plaintiff is not in possession. The defendants are also not in a possession of the suit

property. The finding has also been recorded that the burden of proof was on the plaintiff in the suit to establish title and possession for injunction.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that in support of his case, the plaintiff filed the sale deed of the year 2012 in his favour executed by the plaintiff's vendor and also filed the sale deed which was infavour of the plaintiff's vendor dated 19.02.1969. He further submits that defendant's case inter-alia was that one Ganta Subbaramaiah who was the absolute owner of the plaint C Schedule property and was in possession, he adopted one Ganta Chennamma alias Kalluru Chennamma and executed the Will dated 23.06.1967 in his favour. From whom the defendants purchased the property, but, the defendants did not file any document in support of their case. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that under the circumstances, the plaintiff discharged his burden of proof by filing the documents of title but the learned Trial Court taking an erroneous view that the plaintiff's vendor's vendor title could not be proved, dismissed the suit.

4. The matter requires consideration.

5. Issue notice to the respondents.

6. In addition to the normal mode of service, the appellant is permitted to take out personal notice to the respondents by registered post and acknowledgment due and file proof of service in the Registry before the next date of listing.

7. Post after Summer Vacation, 2025.

8. Till the next date of listing, the parties shall maintain status-quo as it exists today and based on this order the parties shall not try to take possession of the scheduled property.

RAVI NATH TILHARI,J

MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM,J

AG