

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH :: AMARAVATI

MAIN CASE NO: A.S. No.554 of 2025

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
03.	30.06.2026	<u>KM,J</u> <u>I.A.No.2 of 2025</u> Heard the learned counsel for the appellants and the respondents. It is stated by the learned counsel for the appellants that during the pendency of the suit, an interim injunction was granted restraining respondents 12 and 13 from alienating the suit schedule property. Therefore, learned counsel for the appellants prays for passing of the same order, pending disposal of the present appeal. The learned counsel for the respondents contends that the trial Court has observed that the suit schedule property is not ancestral property and it is self acquired property of One Sri Chinappa Reddy, and, therefore, the suit schedule property is not capable of being partitioned. In view of the said findings, Sri Narsi Reddy, learned counsel for the respondents, opposed the grant of interim relief. Having regard to the contentions advanced, this Court is of the view that during the pendency of the trial Court, injunction restraining the respondents 12 and 13 from alienating the property was in operation pending disposal of the appeal if	Contd.,

--	--	--	--