

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

**MAIN CASE NO: A.S.Nos.32 of 2016, 1786 of 2018,  
253 of 2021 and 155 of 2022**

**PROCEEDING SHEET**

<b>SL. NO</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER</b>	<b>OFFICE NOTE</b>
28.	18.09.2024	<p><b><u>MB,J &amp; NBK,J</u></b></p> <p><i>Sri A.Venkatesh, learned Senior Counsel representing learned counsel for the appellant in A.S.No.32 of 2016.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. T.S.R.Praneetha, learned counsel representing Sri P.Madhusudhan Reddy, learned counsel for respondent No.2.</i></p> <p>We have heard learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant (defendant No.2 in the Suit) on the point of maintainability. According to counsel the appeal is maintainable as the order passed in the I.A filed by the defendant No.2 has merged into the impugned judgment.</p> <p>Counsel also submits that the impugned judgment is not a consent decree and hence the bar contained in Section 96 (3) of the C.P.C will not be applicable to the impugned decree. Counsel further submits that the appellant, as a 3<sup>rd</sup> party purchaser for value, has an independent right to challenge the impugned decree.</p> <p>List this matter on 23.09.2024 as prayed for to hear learned Senior Counsel appearing for the plaintiffs (respondents before us).</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>MB,J</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>NBK,J</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">VSU</p>	<p><i>Transferred to IO folder before making corrections</i></p>

