

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATHI

MAIN CASE No.W.A.No.917 of 2025

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl.No.	DATE	ORDER	Office Note
01.	02.09.2025	<u>RRR, J & TCDS, J</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2025</u> Dispense with petition is ordered. <u>I.A.Nos.2, 3 & 4 of 2025</u> Issue notice to respondents 2 to 6. Learned counsel for the petitioner/appellant is permitted to take out personal notice to respondents 2 to 6 by RPAD and file proof of service by the next date of hearing. Post on 23.09.2025. <u>I.A.No.5 of 2025</u> This is an application filed to direct the 1st respondent not to alienate the subject property of the sale deed, dated 16.05.2025. Heard Sri M. S. Prasad, learned Senior Counsel appearing for Ms. Satyasiri, learned counsel for the appellant and Sri Ram Babu Devavarapu, learned counsel for the 1st respondent and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Registration and	

		Stamps appearing for the official respondents. Sri M. S. Prasad, learned Senior Counsel would contend that the 1st respondent had purchased property from his vendor, who is arrayed as proposed 5th respondent, admeasuring 158 sq. yards approx., which is situated in D.No.10-323 in Sy.No.14/1 of Sulurpet Municipality, even though the said vendor did not have any title to the land. The learned Senior Counsel would also contend that the transaction is vitiated by fraud, as the respondents 5 & 6, after obtaining orders from this Court, which are presently impugned in the Writ Appeal, directing the Sub-Registrar not to proceed to register the sale deed, had approached the Sub-Registrar, Patamata and got registered the said document with significant variations between the document placed before this Court and the document which was finally registered by the Sub-Registrar, Patamata. Sri D. Ram Babu, learned counsel for the 1st respondent would contend that the transaction in question was a <i>bona fide</i> transaction and his vendor had clear title to the land. He seeks time to file counter affidavit, setting out the facts. <i>Prima facie</i>, this Court is of the view that	
--	--	--	--

		it would be appropriate to ensure that there are no alienations in this property, pending disposal of the Writ Appeal. Accordingly, there shall be a direction to the 1st respondent not to alienate the said property and with a further direction to respondents 4 & 6 not to register any document of alienation relating to the aforesaid property, pending further orders. This order is subject to any direction that may be given in W.P.No.10818 of 2025, which is filed by the vendee of the appellant. <u>RRR, J</u> <u>TCDS, J</u> MJA	
--	--	--	--