

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE: A.S.No.240 of 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
01.	08.06.2026	<u>RY, J</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2026</u> This application is filed to condone the delay of 360 days in representation of the main Appeal Suit. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner/appellant/plaintiff. Perused the record. For the reasons mentioned in the accompanying affidavit, this application is allowed subject to payment of costs of Rs.500/- (Rupees five hundred only) to the High Court Legal Services Committee, Hyderabad, within fifteen (15) days from today. <u>I.A.No.2 of 2026</u> This application is filed to grant ad-interim injunction restraining the respondents/defendants from further alienating the plaint schedule property in O.S.No.111 of 2007 on the file of the III Additional District Judge, Sangareddy. Heard Sri Botla Venkteswara Rao, learned counsel representing Sri M.V. Durga Prasad, learned counsel for the appellant/plaintiff. Perused the record.	

		Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant/plaintiff filed a suit for specific performance in O.S.No.111 of 2007 on the file of the III Additional District Judge, Sangareddy and the same has been dismissed, vide judgment and decree dated 21.01.2025. The primary reason given for dismissal is that the agreement of sale dated 07.11.2005 consists of signature of only one owner when there are two owners. In that context, the trial Court held that the validity of agreement of sale dated 11.07.2005 is not proven and proceeded to dismiss the suit. Aggrieved by the same, the present Appeal Suit is preferred. He further submits that the trial Court has taken a technical ground for dismissing the suit when the owners are husband and wife and they have jointly executed a sale deed with respect to suit schedule property before filing of the suit. He further submits that on service of legal notice, the owners of the subject property did not take any objection about non-signing of the agreement of sale for one of the owners and the said ground was taken <i>suo motu</i> by the trial Court. It is submitted that to prevent further alienation, there is need to restrain the respondents from alienating the subject property during pendency of the present appeal suit.	
--	--	---	--

In the circumstances stated, both the parties are hereby directed to maintain *status quo* as on today with regard to the alienation.

List on 06.07.2026.

A.S.No.240 of 2026

Call for the records.

Issue notice to the respondents/defendants and their counsel on record before the lower Court concerned.

Personal notice is also permitted.

List on 06.07.2026.

RY,J
Isn

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--