



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

[3572]

MONDAY, THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE BALAJI MEDAMALLI

CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS APPEAL NO: 566/2010

Between:

1. NETHALA VENKATA SESHAGIRI, E.G. DISTRICT, S/O N. TATA RAO
R/O TATIPAKA VILLAGE RAZOLE MANDAL, E.G. DISTRICT

...APPELLANT

AND

1. NETALA SUDHARANI E G DISTRICT, W/o Venkata Seshagiri C/o
Gutam Village Razole Mandal, E.G. District

...RESPONDENT

Counsel for the Appellant:

1. T V S PRABHAKARA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent:

1. D V V S S N H BHUJANGA RAO

CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS APPEAL NO: 889/2010

Between:

1. NETHALA VENKATA SESHAGIRI, E.G. DIST., S/O N. TATA RAO R/O.
TATIPAKA VILLAGE, RAZOLE MANDAL, E.G. DISTRICT.

...APPELLANT

AND

1.NETALA SUDHARANI E G DIST, W/o Venkata Seshagiri C/o. Gutam
Venkamma R/o Kadali Village, Razole Mandal, E.G. District.

...RESPONDENT

Counsel for the Appellant:

1.T V S PRABHAKARA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent:

1.D V V S S N H BHUJANGA RAO

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE BALAJI MEDAMALLI

C.M.A Nos.566 and 889 of 2010

COMMON JUDGMENT: *(per Hon'ble Sri Justice Ravi Nath Tilhari)*

The petition filed by the husband seeking divorce in O.P.No.6 of 2007 was dismissed, whereas O.P.No.33 of 2007 filed by the wife seeking restitution of conjugal rights was allowed by a common order dated 03.03.2010. Aggrieved thereby, the husband has filed the present appeals.

2. None appears for the appellant.
3. Both the C.M.As are dismissed for want of prosecution.

There shall be no order as to costs.

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

RAVI NATH TILHARI, J

BALAJI MEDAMALLI, J

Date: 27.04.2026.
Pab

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE BALAJI MEDAMALLI

C.M.A Nos.566 and 889 of 2010

27.04.2026

Pab