



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

[3331]

THURSDAY, THE ELEVENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 1604/2026

Between:

- 1.M/S BHAGYA LAKSHMI MEDICAL AGENCIES, REP.BY ITS PROP KODALI BHAGYA LAKSHMI, W/O KODALI RAMA KRISHNA AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS, R/O DOOR NO. 13-2-28,1ST LINE GUNTURVARI THOTA, NEAR GOUDIYA MATHAM,KOTHAPET, GUNTUR, GUNTUR DISTRICT-522001
- 2.KODALI BHAGYA LAKSHMI,, W/O KODALI RAMA KRISHNA, PROP OF M/S.BHAGYA LAKSHMI MEDICAL AGENCIES AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS, R/O DOOR NO. 12-19-137 1ST LINE, GUNTURVARI THOTA NEAR GOUDIYA MATHAM,KOTHAPET, GUNTUR, GUNTUR DISTRICT-522001.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

- 1.M/S SRI VINAYAKA MEDICAL STORES NEW, REP. BY ITS PROPX. NARENDRA NAGAJYOTHI. W/O DR.NARENDRA VENKATA RAMANA, HINDU ,AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS, R/O DOOR NO. 12-2-25,GROUND FLOOR, 1ST LINE, GUNTURVARI THOTA NEAR GOUDIYA MATHAM,KOTHAPET, GUNTUR, GUNTUR DISTRICT-522001.
- 2.NARENDRA NAGAJYOTHI, PROP. SRI VINAYAKA MEDICAL STORES (NEW). W/O DR.NARENDRAVENKATA RAMANA, HINDU ,AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS, RIO DOOR NO. 12-2-25,GROUND FLOOR, 1ST LINE, GUNTURVARI THOTA NEAR GOUDIYA MATHAM,KOTHAPET, GUNTUR, GUNTUR DISTRICT-522001

...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 returns/objections dated 08-05-2026, 19-05-2026, 26-05-2026 and 01-06-2026 in CFR No.4974/2026 passed by the learned before Vacation Court, Guntur (In The Court of The Civil And Sessions Judge (District Division Guntur), whereby the plaint and accompanying interlocutory applications were returned on the ground of commercial jurisdiction, and consequently direct the learned Vacation Court (In The Court of The Civil And Sessions Judge (District Division Guntur) to receive and number the plaint and urgent interlocutory applications filed under Order XXXVIII Rule 5 CPC and Section 151 CPC, pass appropriate orders thereon in accordance with law, and thereafter transmit/forward the matter to the competent Commercial Court, Vijayawada, if so required, 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 the filing of the certified copy of docket order i.e., returns/objections dated 08-05-2026, 19-05-2026, 26-05-2026 and 01-06-2026 in CFR No.4974/2026 passed by the learned before Vacation Court, Guntur (In The Court of The Civil And Sessions Judge (District Division: Guntur) and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. GANGARAJU JAGADEESACHANDRABABU NARASIMHA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

The Court made the following:

::ORDER::

The above Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the docket endorsement dated 26.05.2026, returning the plaint on the ground of jurisdiction.

2. Heard Sri G.Jagadeesa Chandra Babu, learned counsel for the petitioner. No notice is ordered to the respondents since the suit itself is not numbered.

3. The petitioners, being the plaintiffs, filed suit *vide* CFR.No.4974 of 2026 on 08.05.2026 against the respondents herein for recovery of the amount before the Vacation Judge-cum-X Additional District Judge at Guntur District. On 08.05.2026, the plaint was returned with an endorsement "this Court has no jurisdiction as the claim is a commercial transaction."

4. On 19.05.2026, it was represented that the Vacation Judge-cum-X Additional District Judge got jurisdiction and the plaint was resubmitted. On the very same day, the plaint was returned, specifically mentioning that the objections dated 08.05.2026 were not properly explained. Learned counsel for the petitioner represented the plaint again, on 26.05.2026. Again, the Vacation Judge-cum-X Additional District Judge returned the plaint on 01.06.2026, stating that the objections dated 26.05.2026 were not complied with.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the Vacation Judge-cum-X Additional District Judge got jurisdiction to entertain the suit.

6. The High Court of Andhra Pradesh issued an order *vide* Roc.No.422/2026/B/Spl dated 08.05.2026 notifying the Summer Vacation and appointing the Vacation Officers in the cadre of District and Sessions Judges in all the Districts. As seen from the notification, two officers were appointed in Krishna District, wherein the designated Commercial Court is located.

7. The Secretary to the Government, Legal, Legislative Affairs and Justice, issued G.O.Ms.No.78 LAW (L,LA&J-HOME-COURTS-A) Department, dated 16.05.2019, assigning jurisdiction to the Special Courts

at Visakhapatnam and Vijayawada in respect of Commercial Courts. In respect of four Districts, namely, Srikakulam, Vizianagaram, Visakhapatnam and East Godavari, the Special Court at Visakhapatnam have the territorial jurisdiction. In respect of the other nine Districts, the Special Court at Vijayawada has jurisdiction.

8. Since the Vacation Officers were appointed to the Krishna District during the Summer Vacation, in the considered opinion of this court, the Vacation Officer has jurisdiction to entertain the plaint in respect of commercial disputes as well. As the Vacation Officer at Guntur District has no jurisdiction and rightly returned the plaint with an endorsement referred *supra*.

9. At the hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to present the suit before the Vacation Officer, Krishna District.

10. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, the Civil Revision Petition is disposed of, granting liberty to the petitioner to present the plaint before the Vacation Officer at Krishna District. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

SUBBA REDDY SATTI, J

Date: 11th June, 2026

ANS/RKS