

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

* * * *

CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.2225 of 2025

Between:

Surisetty Appala Raju

..... PETITIONER

AND

Gotimukkala Perraju and 7 others

....RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT RESERVED : 27.02.2026

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED : 10.04.2026

DATE OF JUDGMENT UPLOADED : 10.04.2026

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgments? Yes/No
2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals Yes/No
3. Whether Your Lordships wish to see the
fair copy of the Judgment? Yes/No

RAVI NATH TILHARI, J

*** THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI**
+ CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.2225 of 2025

% 10.04.2026

Surisetty Appala Raju

....Petitioner

Versus

\$ Gotimukkala Perraju and 7 others

....Respondents

! Counsel for the Petitioner : A. V. Pardha Saradhi

^ Counsel for respondents : Sri Venkata Saketh Roy Vidyula

< Gist :

> Head Note:

? Cases Referred:

1. (2006) 6 SCC 498
2. (2004) 6 SCC 415
3. 2018 (2) ALD 315
4. Unreported judgment dt.11.12.2025
In WP.No.15490 of 2025, High Court of Bombay
5. 2025 SCC OnLine AP 3592
6. (2019) 4 SCC 332
7. (2009) 10 SCC 84
8. (2012) 11 SCC 341
9. (2008) 5 SCC 117
10. (2012) 2 SCC 300

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
CIVIL REVISION PETITION No. 2225 of 2025

JUDGMENT:

Heard Sri A. V. Pardha Saradhi, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Venkata Saketh Roy Vydyula, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. This civil revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has been filed by the petitioner/plaintiff in the suit. The challenge is to the Order dated 28.07.2025 passed by the VI Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Visakhapatnam in I. A. No. 317 of 2025 in O. S. No. 1094 of 2014. I.A. No. 317 of 2025 was filed by the plaintiff/petitioner for amendment under Order VI Rule 17 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 (in short 'CPC') and the same was rejected.

I. Facts:

3. The plaintiff instituted the suit against the defendants/respondents 1 to 8 seeking mandatory injunction for removal of wall constructed by the defendants and also for permanent injunction restraining the defendants from making any further construction after removal of the wall.

4. The prayer in the plaint reads as under:

“VI. Therefore, the plaintiff humbly prays that the Honourable Court may be pleased to pass a decree and judgment in his favour and against the defendant for:

a) To grant mandatory injunction directing the defendants to remove the wall constructed by them illegally which is shown in red in the rough sketch;

- b) To grant consequential permanent injunction restraining defendants from making any further construction after removal of the illegally constructed wall shown in red in the sketch, directing the defendants 1, 2 & 3 to leave a clear way of 12 feet for ever from the 30 feet main road on the wet leading to the plaintiff's house;
- c) For costs of the suit and
- d) To grant such other relief or reliefs as the Honourable Court may deem fit and proper under the circumstances of the case.”

5. At the stage of evidence and belatedly almost after about 11 years the application for amendment was filed. The plaintiff sought declaration that the construction made by the defendants in an extent of 11 square yards into 12 feet wide road as shown in the plaint plan were illegal and consequential mandatory injunction to remove those construction and in case defendants failed to comply, permit the plaintiff to remove the constructions and recover the expenses from the defendants. The plaintiff prayed to substitute by amendment, para-VI (a) of the plaint with the following paragraph:

“VI (a) To declare that the constructions made by the defendants in an extent of 11 sq.yds into 12 feet wide road as shown in the plaint plan are illegal and consequential mandatory injunction to remove the illegal construction made into 12 feet wide road the defendants failed to comply with the same, permit the plaintiff to remove the same and recover the expenses from the defendants.”

6. Defendants/respondents 1, 2, 5 to 8 filed counters. They submitted that the petitioner could not be permitted to seek amendment as the trial had commenced. The petition was filed at a belated stage as well at the time of

evidence of DW 2 only to drag on the proceedings. There was lack of due diligence at a earliest point of time in applying for amendment.

II. Impugned Order:

7. The learned VI Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Visakhapatnam framed the following points for determination.

“Whether the petitioner is entitled for the relief of amendment of pleadings in the plaint, as prayed for?”

8. The learned trial Court held that the trial had commenced. As per Order VI Rule 17 CPC its proviso, there was a bar that no application for amendment was allowed after the trial commenced and unless the Court was satisfied that in spite of due diligence the plaintiff could not have filed the application for amendment before the commencement of trial. The suit was at the fag end. The plaintiff could not satisfy that in spite of due diligence he could not file the application for amendment before commencement of trial. The cause stated by the plaintiffs was that due to inadvertence the plaintiff failed to notice the issue framed by the trial Court. The learned trial Court held that it was not believable that the plaintiff was not aware of the issues framed and got knowledge only after lapse of 8 years from framing of the issues. Such fact did not prove the due diligence on the part of the plaintiff. Thus considered, the learned trial Court dismissed the application.

III. Submissions of learned counsel:

i) For Petitioner:

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the amendment can be allowed at any stage of the proceedings. The learned trial Court was not right in dismissing the application for amendment on the ground of delay. He submitted that the commencement of trial in proviso to Order VI Rule 17 CPC must be understood in the limited sense, meaning the final hearing of suit, examination of witness, filing of documents and the stage of arguments. He submitted that since the stage of addressing the arguments had not been reached, therefore, it cannot be said that the trial had commenced. In his submission, the proviso to Rule 17 of Order VI CPC was not attracted.

10. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the amendment was only in the prayer clause and it did not require leading of further evidence and no prejudice would have been caused to the defendants if the amendment was allowed.

11. Learned counsel for the petitioner placed reliance in the following judgments:

1. ***Baldev Singh v. Manohar Singh***¹
2. ***Pankaja v. Yellappa (D) by Lrs.***²
3. ***Dhulipalla Srinivasa Rao v. Kandula Govardhana Rao***³
4. ***Sushila Gopal Tejale v. Babanbai Sakharam Chandramore***⁴

¹ (2006) 6 SCC 498

² (2004) 6 SCC 415

³ 2018 (2) ALD 315

⁴ Unreported judgment dt.11.12.2025,
In WP.No.15490 of 2025, High Court of Bombay

ii) For Respondents:

12. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that after framing of the issues, the trial had commenced. The stage is of cross examination of PW.2. It cannot be said that the trial had not commenced. Proviso to Order VI Rule 17 CPC was attracted and unless due diligence was shown the amendment could not be allowed. He submitted that the plea taken by the plaintiff, that, the plaintiff was not aware of the issues as framed, is not the due diligence within the meaning of this expression in proviso to Order VI Rule 17 CPC. He submitted that the delay is also to be taken into account when the application for amendment had been filed at highly belated stage only to drag on the proceedings of the suit.

13. Learned counsel for the respondents placed reliance in the following judgments:

1. ***Mahammed Saleem v. Neeladri Appanna***⁵
2. ***M. Revanna v. Anjanamma (Dead) by LRs***⁶
3. ***Revajeetu Builders and Developers v. Narayanaswamy and Sons***⁷.

IV. Point for determination:

14. The following point arises for consideration and determination:

⁵ 2025 SCC OnLine AP 3592

⁶ (2019) 4 SCC 332

⁷ (2009) 10 SCC 84

"Whether the application for amendment in plaint has been rightly rejected by the impugned order under the provisions of Order VI Rule 17, Proviso CPC?"

V. Consideration:

15. I have considered the aforesaid submissions and perused the material on record.

16. Order VI Rule 17 CPC reads as under:

"17. Amendment of pleadings.—The Court may at any stage of the proceedings allow either party **to alter or amend his pleadings** in such manner and on such terms as may be just, and all such amendments shall be made as may be necessary for the purpose of determining the real questions in controversy between the parties:

Provided that no application for amendment shall be allowed after the trial has commenced, unless the Court comes to the conclusion that in spite of due diligence, the party could not have raised the matter before the commencement of trial."

17. In ***Revajeetu Builders and Developers*** (supra) the Hon'ble Apex Court on consideration of various pronouncements on the issue of amendment laid down the principles and the factors to be taken into consideration while dealing with the applications for amendments, which are as follows, vide paragraphs 63 and 64:

"Factors to be taken into consideration while dealing with applications for amendments

63. On critically analysing both the English and Indian cases, some basic principles emerge which ought to be taken into consideration while allowing or rejecting the application for amendment:

(1) whether the amendment sought is imperative for proper and effective adjudication of the case;

(2) whether the application for amendment is bona fide or mala fide;

(3) the amendment should not cause such prejudice to the other side which cannot be compensated adequately in terms of money;

(4) refusing amendment would in fact lead to injustice or lead to multiple litigation;

(5) whether the proposed amendment constitutionally or fundamentally changes the nature and character of the case; and

(6) as a general rule, the court should decline amendments if a fresh suit on the amended claims would be barred by limitation on the date of application.

These are some of the important factors which may be kept in mind while dealing with application filed under Order 6 Rule 17. These are only illustrative and not exhaustive.

64. The decision on an application made under Order 6 Rule 17 is a very serious judicial exercise and the said exercise should never be undertaken in a casual manner. We can conclude our discussion by observing that while deciding applications for amendments the courts must not refuse bona fide, legitimate, honest and necessary amendments and should never permit mala fide, worthless and/or dishonest amendments.”

18. In ***Pankaja*** (supra) cited by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the Hon’ble Apex Court held that the jurisdiction to allow or not to allow an amendment being discretionary, the same will have to be exercised on a judicious evaluation of the facts and circumstances in which the amendment is sought. If the granting of an amendment really subserves the ultimate cause of justice and avoids further litigation the same should be allowed. There can be no straitjacket formula for allowing or disallowing an amendment of pleadings.

19. So, on the point of amendment of pleadings, it is settled in law that all such amendments shall be allowed as may be necessary for the purpose of determining the real questions in controversy between the parties and such an amendment can be allowed at any stage of the proceedings.

20. Now, the proviso to Order VI Rule 17 CPC clearly provides that no application for amendment shall be allowed after the trial has commenced, unless the Court comes to the conclusion that in spite of due diligence the party could not have raised the matter before the commencement of trial.

21. In other words, even after commencement of trial, an amendment of the pleadings can be allowed, but the applicant has to satisfy the Court that there was due diligence and in spite thereof he could not apply for amendment before the commencement of trial.

22. In ***M. Revanna*** (supra) the Hon'ble Apex Court laid down that the proviso to Order 6 Rule 17 CPC virtually prevents an application for amendment of pleadings from being allowed after the trial has commenced, unless the court comes to the conclusion that in spite of due diligence, the party could not have raised the matter before the commencement of the trial. The proviso, to an extent, curtails absolute discretion to allow amendment at any stage. Therefore, the burden is on the person who seeks an amendment after commencement of the trial to show that in spite of due diligence, such an amendment could not have been sought earlier. There cannot be any dispute that an amendment cannot be claimed as a matter of right, and under all circumstances. Para-7 of ***M. Revanna*** (supra) reads as under:

“7. Leave to amend may be refused if it introduces a totally different, new and inconsistent case, or challenges the fundamental character of the suit. **The proviso to Order 6 Rule 17 CPC virtually prevents an application for amendment of pleadings from being allowed after the trial has commenced, unless the court comes to the conclusion that in spite of due diligence, the party could not have raised the matter before the commencement of the trial. The proviso, to an extent, curtails absolute discretion to allow amendment at any stage.** Therefore, the burden is on the person who seeks an amendment after commencement of the trial to show that in spite of due diligence, such an amendment could not have been sought earlier. There cannot be any dispute that an amendment cannot be claimed as a matter of right, and under all circumstances. Though normally amendments are allowed in the pleadings to avoid multiplicity of litigation, the court needs to take into consideration whether the application for amendment is bona fide or mala fide and whether the amendment causes such prejudice to the other side which cannot be compensated adequately in terms of money.”

23. In ***Abdul Rehman v. Mohd. Ruldu***⁸ it was held that the parties to the suit are permitted to bring forward the amendments of the pleadings at any stage of the proceedings for the purpose of determining the real question in controversy between them and that the Courts have to be liberal in accepting the same, if such application for amendment is made prior to commencement of trial, and that when the application is made after the commencement of trial, in that event the Court has to arrive at a conclusion that in spite of due diligence the party could not have raised the matter before commencement of the trial. Para-10 and 11 in ***Abdul Rehman*** (supra) reads as under:

⁸ (2012) 11 SCC 341

“**10.** Before considering the factual details and the materials placed by the appellants praying for amendment of their plaint, it is useful to refer Order 6 Rule 17 which is as under:

“**17. *Amendment of pleadings.***—The court may at any stage of the proceedings allow either party to alter or amend his pleading in such manner and on such terms as may be just, and all such amendments shall be made as may be necessary for the purpose of determining the real questions in controversy between the parties:

Provided that no application for amendment shall be allowed after the trial has commenced, unless the court comes to the conclusion that in spite of due diligence, the party could not have raised the matter before the commencement of trial.”

It is clear that parties to the suit are permitted to bring forward amendment of their pleadings at any stage of the proceeding for the purpose of determining the real question in controversy between them. The courts have to be liberal in accepting the same, if the same is made prior to the commencement of the trial. If such application is made after the commencement of the trial, in that event, the court has to arrive at a conclusion that in spite of due diligence, the party could not have raised the matter before the commencement of trial.

11. The original provision was deleted by Amendment Act 46 of 1999, however, it has again been restored by Amendment Act 22 of 2002 but with an added proviso to prevent application for amendment being allowed after the trial has commenced, unless the court comes to the conclusion that in spite of due diligence, the party could not have raised the matter before the commencement of trial. The above proviso, to some extent, curtails absolute discretion to allow amendment at any stage. At present, if application is filed after commencement of trial, it has to be shown that in spite of due diligence, it could not have been sought earlier. The object of the rule is that courts should try the merits of the case that come before them and should, consequently, allow all amendments that may be necessary for determining the real question in controversy between the parties provided it does not cause injustice or prejudice to the other side. This Court, in a series of decisions has held that the

power to allow the amendment is wide and can be exercised at any stage of the proceeding in the interest of justice. The main purpose of allowing the amendment is to minimise the litigation and the plea that the relief sought by way of amendment was barred by time is to be considered in the light of the facts and circumstances of each case. The above principles have been reiterated by this Court in *J. Samuel v. Gattu Mahesh* [(2012) 2 SCC 300 : (2012) 1 SCC (Civ) 801] and *Rameshkumar Agarwal v. Rajmala Exports (P) Ltd.* [(2012) 5 SCC 337 : (2012) 3 SCC (Civ) 92] Keeping the above principles in mind, let us consider whether the appellants have made out a case for amendment.

24. So, the expression 'commencement of trial' and 'due diligence' are of relevance and importance.

25. The expression "commencement of trial" was considered in ***Baldev Singh*** (supra). The Hon'ble Apex Court held that the proviso to Order VI Rule 17 CPC provides that the amendment of pleading shall not be allowed when the trial of the suit has already been commenced. The Hon'ble Apex Court held that the commencement of trial must be understood in the limited sense as meaning the final hearing of the suit, examination of witnesses, filing of documents and addressing of arguments.

26. Paragraph No.17 of ***Baldev Singh*** (supra) is as under:

“17. Before we part with this order, we may also notice that proviso to Order 6 Rule 17 CPC provides that amendment of pleadings shall not be allowed when the trial of the suit has already commenced. For this reason, we have examined the records and find that, in fact, the trial has not yet commenced. It appears from the records that the parties have yet to file their documentary evidence in the suit. From the record, it also appears that the suit was not on the verge of conclusion as found by the High Court and the trial court. That apart, **commencement of trial as used in proviso to Order 6 Rule 17 in the Code of Civil Procedure must be understood in the limited sense as meaning the**

final hearing of the suit, examination of witnesses, filing of documents and addressing of arguments. As noted hereinbefore, parties are yet to file their documents, we do not find any reason to reject the application for amendment of the written statement in view of proviso to Order 6 Rule 17 CPC which confers wide power and unfettered discretion to the court to allow an amendment of the written statement at any stage of the proceedings.”

27. The submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that addressing of arguments had not taken place, so, the trial has not commenced as all the things are to be taken together i.e., final hearing of suits, examination of witnesses and filing of documents and addressing of arguments and if any of the above stages has not been reached, then there would not be any commencement of trial and in that situation the rejection of the application would not be justified.

28. In **Baldev Singh** (supra) the amendment application was rejected by the trial Court and such rejection was also on the ground that there was no due diligence and the amendment was sought after commencement of trial, along with some other grounds. The contention of the respondent in **Baldev Singh** (supra) was that the documentary evidence had not been filed, and therefore, there was no reason to reject the application for amendment filed under proviso to Order VI Rule 17 CPC. The Hon’ble Apex Court observed that the parties had not filed the documentary evidence in the suit which was not on the verge of conclusion. It was recorded that the trial had not commenced.

29. In the present case the documents have been filed. The oral evidence has also been laid and the case is at the stage of evidence of the

cross examination of DW 2 when the application for amendment was filed. So, in the present case it cannot be said that the trial has not commenced.

30. Expression used is 'commencement of trial' in the proviso to Order VI Rule 17 CPC and not 'conclusion of trial'. All these stages, after framing of issues, filing of documents etc., examination of witnesses and addressing of arguments are during the trial and after the stage of final hearing the judgment is either delivered then and there / or the suit is reserved for judgment. In either case, the trial comes to an end or is concluded, by delivering judgment then and there or by reserving the judgment. If the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is accepted that unless all those things are taken together the trial has not commenced, that would amount to rewriting the proviso to Order 6 Rule 17 CPC and in that case the use of expressions 'commencement' and 'due diligence' would be rendered nugatory.

31. In **Baldev Singh** (supra) the meaning of the 'commencement of trial' is very clear. It cannot be understood, in the way the submission has been advanced by the petitioner's counsel. The commencement of trial and all the stages as mentioned in **Baldev Singh** (supra) are during the trial. The ratio of the said judgment is that after commencement of trial, at any stage, during trial, i.e., examination of witnesses, filing of documents, final hearing of suit, addressing of arguments, the application for amendment can be filed because filing of such an application for amendment at any of those stages would be after the commencement of the trial. The filing of application for amendment or even allowing the application for amendment at any of those

stages is not barred under the proviso to Order VI Rule 17 CPC. But for considering such an application for amendment, besides the other factors, what would be required to prove is the due diligence, i.e., subject to the condition of the satisfaction of due diligence by the Court which is a pre-condition under the proviso itself.

32. This Court is of the view that notwithstanding commencement of trial, the amendment can be allowed and there is no bar in allowing the application even after commencement of trial, but the requirement is that the applicant must satisfy the Court that in spite of due diligence, he could not apply for amendment prior to the commencement of trial.

33. In ***Chander Kanta Bansal v. Rajinder Singh Anand***⁹ the Hon'ble Apex Court considered the meaning of the term 'due diligence'. It was answered that the words "due diligence" have not been defined in the Code. According to Oxford Dictionary (Edn. 2006), the word "diligence" means careful and persistent application or effort. "Diligent" means careful and steady in application to one's work and duties, showing care and effort. As per Black's Law Dictionary (18th Edn.), "diligence" means a continual effort to accomplish something, care; caution; the attention and care required from a person in a given situation. "Due diligence" means the diligence reasonably expected from, and ordinarily exercised by a person who seeks to satisfy a legal requirement or to discharge an obligation. According to Words and Phrases by Drain-Dyspnea (Permanent Edn.13-A) "due diligence", in law, means doing everything

⁹ (2008) 5 SCC 117

reasonable, not everything possible. Unless the party takes prompt steps, mere action cannot be accepted and file a petition after the commencement of trial.

34. In ***Samuel v. Gattu Mahesh***¹⁰ the Hon'ble Apex Court held that the term 'due diligence' is used in the Code so as to provide a test for determining whether to exercise the discretion in situations of requested amendment after the commencement of the trial. Relevant paragraphs 19 and 23 read as under:

"19. Due diligence is the idea that reasonable investigation is necessary before certain kinds of relief are requested. Duly diligent efforts are a requirement for a party seeking to use the adjudicatory mechanism to attain an anticipated relief. An advocate representing someone must engage in due diligence to determine that the representations made are factually accurate and sufficient. The term 'Due diligence' is specifically used in the Code so as to provide a test for determining whether to exercise the discretion in situations of requested amendment after the commencement of trial.

23. Though the counsel for the appellants have cited many decisions, on perusal, we are of the view that some of those cases have been decided prior to the insertion of Order VI Rule 17 with proviso or on the peculiar facts of that case. This Court in various decisions upheld the power that in deserving cases, the Court can allow delayed amendment by compensating the other side by awarding costs. The entire object of the amendment to Order VI Rule 17 as introduced in 2002 is to stall filing of application for amending a pleading subsequent to the commencement of trial, to avoid surprises and that the parties had sufficient knowledge of other's case. It also helps checking the delays in filing the applications. [vide [Aniglase Yohannan vs. Ramlatha and Others](#), (2005) 7 SCC 534, [Ajendraprasadji N. Pandey and Another vs. Swami Keshavprakeshdasji N. and Others](#), Chander Kanta Bansal vs. Rajinder Singh Anand, (2008) 5 SCC 117, Rajkumar Guraward (dead) through

¹⁰ (2012) 2 SCC 300

LRS. vs. [S.K.Sarwagi and Company Private Limited and Another, \(2008\) 14 SCC 364](#), [Vidyabai and Others vs. Padmalatha and Another, \(2009\) 2 SCC 409](#), and [Man Kaur \(dead\) By LRS vs. Hartar Singh Sangha, \(2010\) 10 SCC 512](#).
(emphasis Supplied)”

35. The petitioner’s contention about the due diligence, is that the plaintiff was not aware of the issues framed. Such contention, firstly, cannot be believed and even if it be so that, he was not aware of the issues framed, such non-awareness of framing of issues cannot be a ground so as to constitute due diligence for not applying amendment in plaint. The plaintiff is not applying to the Court for reframing of issues or for additional issues to be framed in the suit. So, the plaintiff’s awareness or no awareness about the issues framed is of no relevance in the matter of amendment of plaint.

36. The due diligence means that the applicant was vigilant, he exercised such reasonable care which is expected of a reasonable man to apply for amendment before commencement of trial and to show that in spite thereof the application could not be filed. The plaintiff has failed to prove the due diligence in filing the application for amendment of plaint filed after the commencement of trial and unless the due diligence was proved, the application for amendment could not be allowed.

37. There is no dispute on the proposition of law on the point of amendment of pleadings as in the case of ***Dhulipalla Srinivasa Rao*** (supra), ***Sushila Gopal Tejale*** (supra) and ***Mahammed Saleem*** (supra), in which also the same principle of law on amendment, including the scope of proviso to Order VI Rule 17 CPC has been discussed.

38. Further, I find force in the submission advanced by the learned counsel for the respondents, that the application was filed only to delay the proceedings of the suit which was filed in the year 2014, the same is also the finding recorded by the learned trial Court, that to prolong the proceedings of the suit, this application was filed.

39. Additionally, the learned counsel for the petitioner could not satisfy the Court as to why such an amendment in the prayer clause was required. The reason is that, the declaration sought is, that the constructions raised by the defendant to a certain extent in the alleged common passage be declared to be as illegal. The plaintiff had already prayed for demolition/removal of those constructions alleging those to be illegal and raised in the common passage. If the Court during trial finds that the plaint schedule property i.e., the alleged common passage, is common passage and the construction has been made illegally, a prayer for demolition can be granted even without there being the prayer, as sought to be amended in the manner prayed.

VI. Conclusions:

40. In view of the aforesaid, this Court is of the considered view that the application for amendment filed by the petitioner was after the commencement of trial and the petitioner failed to show that in spite of due diligence, the application could not be filed before the commencement of the trial and consequently, in view of the proviso to Order VI Rule 17 CPC the learned trial Court was right in rejecting the application for amendment.

41. The point for determination is answered accordingly.

VII. Result:

42. Thus, considered. I do not find any force in the civil revision petition which is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed in consequence.

RAVI NATH TILHARI, J

Date:10.04.2026
Dsr

Note:
LR copy to be marked
B/o
Dsr