

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY THREE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE P. SREE SUDHA

APPEAL SUIT NO: 261 OF 2010

Appeal Under Section 96 of C.P.C against the Judgment and Decree dated 16-02-2010 made in O.S.No.185 of 2003 on the file of the Court of the V Additional District Judge, (FTC), Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar.

Between:

G.Srisailam, S/o. Late Laxmaiah, aged about 58 years, Occ: Business, H.No.6-53
Canath Nagar, Peerzadiguda Ghatkesar Ranga Reddy District
...Appellant/Plaintiff

AND

1. A.Lakshminarayana, S/o. A.Yellaiah, aged about 54 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o. 12-11-194/1 Brahmana Basthi Warasiguda, Secunderabad
2. A.Ramulu, S/o. A.Yellaiah, R/o. 12-11-193/4, Brahmana Basthi, Warasiguda
Secunderabad
3. P. Srinivasa Reddy, S/o. Venkat Reddy, aged 64 years, Occ: MLA of Kovvur
A.P., R/o H.No.9-131/8, Street No. 5, HMT Nagar, Nacharam

The 3rd Defendant Impleaded I.A.No.19 of 2006 dated 26-4-2007
...Respondents/Defendants

I.A. NO: 1 OF 2010(ASMP. NO: 809 OF 2010)

Petition under Order No.39 Rule 1 & 2 R/w 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 grant interim injunction restraining the respondents from alienating the schedule property or to change the nature of the said land, pending disposal of the main appeal.

Counsel for the Appellant: SRI J.P. SRIKANTH (Not Appeared)

Counsel for the Respondents 1 & 2: SRI V. RAMA KRISHNA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent No.3: SRI B. RAJA SEKHAR REDDY

The Court delivered the following: JUDGMENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE P. SREE SUDHA

APPEAL SUIT NO. 261 OF 2010

JUDGMENT:

Appellant/Plaintiff filed O.S.No.185 of 2003 on the file of V Additional District Judge (FTC), R.R.District for declaration and the same was dismissed, against which the plaintiff therein preferred the present Appeal Suit before this Court.


2. A perusal of the docket proceedings shows that the learned counsel for the appellant did not evince any interest to pursue the present appeal proceedings. On 08.09.2023 there was no representation on behalf of the learned counsel for the appellant and the matter was directed to be listed under the caption 'for dismissal'. Even today also, there is no representation for the appellant. No purpose would be served in continuing the Appeal Suit.

3. Accordingly, the Appeal Suit is dismissed for non-prosecution.
No order as to costs.

Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

//TRUE COPY//

Sd/- M. MANJULA
DEPUTY REGISTRAR



SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The V Additional District Judge, (FTC), Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar. (with records)
2. One CC to SRI J.P. SRIKANTH, Advocate [OPUC]

3. One CC to SRI B. RAJASEKHAR REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
4. One CC to SRI V. RAMA KRISHNA REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CD Copies

KP/kam



**HIGH COURT
DATED:21/09/2023**

**JUDGMENT
AS.No.261 of 2010**



**DISMISSING THE A.S.
FOR NON PROSECUTION**

⑧ VLW
18/12/23