



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI**

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA
PRASAD**

I.A.No.2 of 2012 (REV.C.M.P.No.18645 of 2012)

in

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 4266 OF 2009

Between:

1. Seelam Srinivasareddy, S/o Venkata Reddy R/o Ganugapadu Village
Tiruvuru Mandal, Krishna District
2. Pasumarthi Tulasidas, S/o Nagalingam R/o Tiruvuru Village & Tiruvur
Mandal Krishna District
3. Vemmireddy Venkata Ramireddy, S/o Rama Kota Reddy R/o Kothuru
Village, Tiruvuru Mandal Krishna District
4. Nannapaneni Venkata Ramana Rao, S/o Rangaiah R/o Tiruvuru Village &
Mandal Krishna District

...Petitioners

AND

1. Bonthu Satyanarayana Reddy, S/o Venkata Reddy Business R/o Tiruvuru
Village R & B Guest House Road, Tiruvuru Krishna District

...Respondent

Counsel for the Petitioner: D GOVERDHANACHARY

Counsel for the Respondent

The Court made the following ORAL ORDER:

I.A.No.2 of 2012 (REV.C.M.P.No.18645 of 2012)
in
CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 4266 OF 2009

Heard Ms. Y. Anupama Devi, learned Counsel for the Review Petitioner/Respondent and Sri Y. Yashwanth, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of Sri V. Sreenivas Rao, learned Counsel for the Respondent/Petitioners.

2. This Application is filed seeking Review of the Final Order in C.R.P.No.4266 of 2009 dated 19.08.2011.

3. Brief facts required for the purpose of the present case are that the Revision Petitioner is the Defendant in O.S.No.17 of 2013 (Old O.S.No.15 of 2007) on the file of XV Additional District Judge, Nuzivid. The said Suit has been filed by the Plaintiffs for Specific Performance of an Agreement of Sale. During the pendency of the Suit, a Memo was filed by the Defendant challenging the admissibility of Ex.A.1 (Agreement of Sale dated 04.11.2006). Since the said Memo was allowed vide Order dated 22.07.2009, this Order dated 22.07.2009 was challenged by the Plaintiff in the present C.R.P.No.4266 of 2009.

4. After considering the contentions of both the parties, learned Single Judge of this Court was pleased to allow the Civil Revision Petition vide Order dated 19.08.2011. Challenging the correctness of the Order in the Civil Revision Petition dated 19.08.2011, the present Review Petition bearing I.A.No.2 of 2012 (REV.C.M.P.No.18645 of 2012) was filed. It is submitted by the Counsel for the Revision Petitioner that during the pendency of the present Civil Revision Petition, O.S.No.17 of 2013 (old O.S.No.15 of 2007) was partly decreed, thereby directing the Defendants to return the advance amount.

5. It is submitted by the Counsel for the parties that the Defendants have not challenged the decree of the Trial Court dated 11.03.2016, and therefore, it has attained finality.

6. Having considered these facts, this Court finds that the cause of action does not survive in the Review Petition bearing I.A.No.2 of 2012 (REV.C.M.P.No.18645 of 2012). Accordingly, the Review Petition bearing I.A.No.2 of 2012 (REV.C.M.P.No.18645 of 2012) is dismissed. No Order as to Costs.

GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD, J

Dt: 28.01.2026

JKS