

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD**

WEDNESDAY, THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF APRIL  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**:PRESENT:**

**THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE RENUKA YARA**

**I.A.No. 1 OF 2026  
IN  
AS NO: 145 OF 2026**

**Between**

B. Upender Reddy, S/o. B.Sathi Reddy

**...Appellant/Defendant No.2**

(Appellant in AS NO: 145 OF 2026  
on the file of High Court)

**AND**

1. T.Shobha, W/o. T.Papi Reddy, Occ.Service, R/o H.No.79, Phase-V, Kukatpally Housing Board, Hyderabad.

**Respondent/Plaintiff**

2. Dundhigal Damodar Reddy, S/o. Raghuapathi Reddy, Occ.Agriculture, R/o.H.No.1-1-30/50/5, Saipuri Colony, Kapra, Secunderabad.

**...Respondent/Defendant No.1**

(Respondents in-do-)

**Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI R GIRI KUMAR**

**Counsel for the Respondent: SRI GADDAM SRINIVAS**

Petition under Section 151 of C.P.C praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to suspend the operation of Judgment and Decree passed in O.S.No.151 of 2016 dated 27.11.2025 on the file of the Principal District and Sessions Judge, at Bhongir, including execution of Judgment and decree, pending disposal of AS No.145 of 2026, on the file of the High Court.

The Court made the following

**ORDER:**

**This application is filed under Section 151 of CPC to suspend the operation of judgment and decree in O.S.151 of 2016, dated**

27.11.2025 on the file of the Principal District Judge at Bhongir, during the pendency of the appeal.

The respondent No.1/plaintiff filed suit vide O.S.No.151 of 2016 for specific performance of contract against the petitioner/appellant/defendant No.1 and respondent No.2/defendant No.2. Said suit has been decreed with costs directing the petitioner and respondent No.2 to receive the balance sale consideration and to execute the registered sale deed in favour of respondent No.1 with respect to suit schedule property.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the suit schedule property would not be alienated during pendency of the appeal and referred to connected matter in A.S.No.522 of 2024, wherein, *status-quo* has been granted.

The learned counsel for respondent No.1 submits that the facts of said A.S.No.522 of 2024 and the present case are different that the purchaser in the present case has suffered a decree with a finding that he is not a *bonafide* purchaser.

Be that as it may, since the petitioner/appellant has a statutory right of first appeal, to enable both the respective parties to put forth their case, both parties are directed to maintain status-quo till the next date of hearing subject to depositing of the costs of the suit.

Sd/- A.JAYASREE  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

  
SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Principal District and Sessions Judge, at Bhongir. ✓
2. T.Shobha, W/o. T.Papi Reddy, Occ.Service, R/o H.No.79, Phase-V, Kukatpally Housing Board, Hyderabad.

3. Dundhigal Damodar Reddy, S/o. Raghuapathi Reddy, Occ.Agriculture,  
R/o.H.No.1-1-30/50/5, Saipuri Colony, Kapra, Secunderabad.

[Addresses 2 & 3 By SPAD]

3. One CC to Sri R.GIRI KUMAR, Advocate [OPUC]

4. One CC to Sri GADDAM SRINIVAS, Advocate [OPUC]

5. One spare copy

**HIGH COURT**

**RY, J**

**DATED: 15-04-2026**

**LIST ON 10.06.2026**

**ORDER**

**I.A.No. 1 OF 2026  
IN  
AS NO: 145 OF 2026**

**DIRECTION**

