



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

[3529]

**TUESDAY, THE NINTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE T.C.D.SEKHAR

I.A.No.1 of 2025 IN/AND

WRIT APPEAL NO: 1144/2025

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent to allow the appeal and set aside the order in W.P.No.6086/2019, dated 16-11-2023 passed by Hon'ble Learned Single Judge Sri. JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI and grant

Between:

- 1.S.RENUKA (DIED),, W/O. SUBRAMANYAM, AGED 53 YEARS,OCC-HOUSEHOLD, R/O. H.NO. 5-35, BAJANAGUDI STREET, RENIGUNTA, CHITTOR DISTRICT.
- 2.PRADEEP KUMAR CONGEEVARAM,, S/O.VENUGOPAL CONGEEVARAM, R/O.H.NO.1-11-211, FLAT NO.204, GURUMOORTHY LANE, NEAR REEBOK SHOWROOM, BEGUMPET, HYDERABAD.
- 3.C.RAJ KUMAR, S/O.VENUGOPAL CONGEEVARAM, R/O.H.NO.1-11-211, FLAT NO.204, GURUMOORTHY LANE, NEAR REEBOK SHOWROOM, BEGUMPET, HYDERABAD.

...APPELLANT(S)

AND

- 1.THE DISTRICT REGISTRAR, SRI BALAJI REGISTRATION DISTRICT

TIRUPATHI, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.

2.THE SUBREGISTRAR, RENIGUTA, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.

3.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, STAMPS AND REGISTRATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR.

4.L AMBIKAPATHI, S/O.C.LAKSHMAN, R/O.D.NO.14-1139-3, PANCHALI NAGAR, RENIGUNTA, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT(S):

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

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 condone the delay of 610 days in filing the appeal against the orders in W.P.No.6086/2019, dated 16-11-2023 in the interest of justice.

IA NO: 2 OF 2025

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 suspend the impugned registered Sale Deed bearing Document No. 1683/2019 dated 12-11-2018 and the consequential entries made in the Encumbrance Register maintained by the 2nd Respondent Office pending disposal of the writ appeal in the interest of justice.

Counsel for the Appellant(S):

1.P NAGENDRA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.D GNANESWARA NAIDU

2.GP FOR REGISTRATION AND STAMPS

The Court made the following judgment:

(Per Hon'ble Sri Justice R Raghunandan Rao)

The appellant herein had approached this Court, by way of W.P.No.6086 of 2019 contending that document No.1683 of 2019, dated 14.03.2019, registered in favour of the 4th respondent, should not have been registered and the same needs to be set aside. The case of the appellant was that the property in question had been subjected to an attachment, in O.S.No.245 of 2018 by virtue of the order, dated 01.10.2018 in I.A.No.521 of 2018 on the file of the X Additional District Judge, Tirupati. On account of this fact, the Registrar has refused to register a deed of alienation in relation to this said property. Aggrieved by the said refusal, an appeal has been made to the District Registry.

2. During the pendency of the appeal, O.S.No.245 of 2018 came to be withdrawn and the District Registrar has allowed the appeal on the ground that there is no subsisting attachment of the property. Thereafter, the 3rd respondent – Sub Registrar had registered the document. Aggrieved by the said registration, the present writ petition came to be filed on the ground that the Sub Registrar could not have registered the document without further application of mind and certain procedural requirement more specifically Rule 58 of the Andhra Pradesh Registration Rules had not been complied. This rule required that no document should be registered unless the parties to the

document appear before the Registrar and the Registrar verifies whether the limitations set out in the Rule 58 of the AP Registration Rules are not available in the case.

3. This writ petition came to be dismissed by a learned Single Judge of this Court, by judgment, dated 16.11.2023.

4. Aggrieved by the said order of dismissal, the appellants have moved the present writ appeal with a delay of 610 days. The explanation for the said delay is that the appellants have moved an appeal against the order but the appeal bundle was returned with certain objections. Thereafter, the bundle was misplaced and could not be resubmitted within time due to which the delay of 610 days had occurred.

5. The said explanation is bald and vague and does not set out the dates on which the bundle had been returned; the dates on which it was realized that the bundle was misplaced and the steps taken to trace the said bundle. Further, no reasons were given as to why the appellant has waited for period of 610 days for filing the papers.

6. In the circumstances, the said explanation for the condonation of delay is not convincing or cogent. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

7. In view of the fact that the application filed to condone the delay of 610 in filing the appeal has been dismissed, nothing further survives in this writ

appeal and the writ appeal is also dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

R. RAGHUNANDAN RAO, J

T.C.D. SEKHAR, J

Date: 09.12.2025
KA

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE T.C.D.SEKHAR

I.A.No.1 of 2025 IN/AND

WRIT APPEAL NO: 1144/2025

Date: 09.12.2025

KA