

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

MAIN CASE No. S.A.No.361 of 2023

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
12.	24.03.2026	<u>VGKR, J</u> <u>I.A.No.02 of 2023</u> Heard both sides. The following Additional Substantial Questions of law in the present Second Appeal have been framed for determination under Section 100 of the Code of Civil Procedure, (for 'short the C.P.C.') 1) <i>"Whether in the facts and circumstances of the case, both the courts below went wrong in not considering second limb of Article 54 of The Limitation Act, 1963, upon the issue of limitation, wherein the date of knowledge of refusal by the deceased 2nd respondent to execute sale deed in favour of 1st respondent had commenced from the year 1992 itself, when a suit for injunction in OS.No.36 of 1992 was filed on the file of the learned Principal District Munsif, Bhimavaram, by</i>	

		<i>the 1st respondent against 2nd respondent, which the courts below missed to observe”?</i> 2) <i>“Whether both the courts below grossly erred in construing date of exhibit A15, Legal Notice alleged to have been issued by 1st respondent/plaintiff as date of commencement of limitation contrary to the evidence available on record”?</i> 3) <i>“Whether the 1st respondent /plaintiff had proved execution of agreement and part payment endorsements and wherein appellant/3rd defendant failed to rebut the same are legally sustainable?”</i> 4) <i>“Whether both the courts below fell in error in not considering the admissions of PWs 1 to 3, with respect to part payment endorsements and exact dates of such payments, which are contrary to each other?”</i> 5) <i>“Whether the courts below grossly erred in not at all looking into</i>	
--	--	--	--

Ex.B6, which was declaration given by 1st respondent/plaintiff before Joint Collector, Eluru, for cancelling his license and surrendering the rice mill to the owner/deceased 2nd respondent on 15.06.1991 itself on the date of expiry of his lease period”

ADMIT:

VGKR, J

S.A.No.361 of 2023

Learned counsel appearing on both sides are present.

Heard Smt. Nimmagadda Revathi, learned counsel for the appellant(s) in part.

For continuation, post the matter on 02.04.2026, under the caption “Part Heard”.

VGKR, J

CVD