

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

FRIDAY ,THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF APRIL

TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 3283 OF 2025



Between:

DatlaVenkata Satya Sitha Ramachandra Raju, S/o Anjaneya Varma,
age- 56yrs, Occ: Business R/o 68-10/A-21, Rajeswarinagar, Kakinada.

Petitioner/Judgment Debtor/Defendant

AND

1. SagiSitarama Raju, S/o Veerabhara Raju, Age: 62yrs, Occ: Employee,
R/o 68-10/A-21, Rajeswarinagar, Kakinada. **(Died)**
2. SagiVenkataSatyavathamma, W/o SagiSitarama Raju, Age: 56yrs, Occ:
Home-maker, R/o 68-10/A-21, Rajeswarinagar, Kakinada.

Respondent/Decree Holders/Plaintiffs

Petition under Section 115 of CPC is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the grounds filed herein, the High Court may be pleased to allow the revision petition by setting aside order dated 03.11.2025 in E.P.No.29/2023 in O.S.NO.33/2013 on the file of III Additional District Judge at Kakinada consequently dismiss the petition.

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

Petition under Section 151 CPC is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the grounds filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to stay all further proceedings order 03.11.2025 , E.P.No.29/2023 in O.S.No.33/2013 on the file of III Additional District Judge, Kakinada during pendency of petition, Pending disposal of CRP 3283 of 2025, on the file of the High Court.

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and the memorandum of grounds filed in support thereof and the earlier order of the

High Court dated 13.02.2026 , 27.02.2026 & 13.03.2026 made herein and the arguments of SRI G V V S VARA PRASAD, Advocate for the Petitioner, Sri M. RAMA REDDY, Advocate for the Respondent No.2, the Court made the following;

ORDER:

“Ms Prashamsha, learned counsel, representing Sri G.V.V.S.Vara Prasad, learned counsel for the petitioner, appeared through virtual mode while sitting in a car, which is in violation of Guideline No.9 of the Standard Operating Procedure for Video Conferencing/virtual hearing before the High court, which reads as follows:

‘The Advocate/Party in person may login from his office, residence, conference room etc., but not from a vehicle like a car. The remote location should be quiet and have sufficient internet coverage. The Advocate/Party should have the camera switched on during Court proceedings. All participants should endeavour to look into the camera, remain attentive and not engage in any other activity during the proceedings.’

Hence, this Court is inclined to impose costs of Rs.2000/- on her i.e., Rs.1,000/- in each case, payable to the Andhra Pradesh High Court Advocates’ Association within a period of two weeks.

Post on 01.05.2026.

Interim orders granted earlier are extended till then.”

**SD/- N.NAGAMMA
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Secretary, Andhra Pradesh High Court Advocates’ Association,
High Court of AP (BY SPECIAL MESSENGER)
2. One CC to SRI. G V V S VARA PRASAD Advocate [OPUC]
3. One CC to SRI. M. RAMA REDDY Advocate [OPUC]
4. One spare copy

HIGH COURT

RC,J

DATED: 17/04/2026

POST ON 01.05.2026

ORDER

CRP.No.3283 of 2025

DIRECTION

