

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

MAIN CASE No: **S.A.Nos.291 and 292 of 2026**

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
	14-08-2026	<u>GPK,J</u> Heard Ms.N.Samhita, learned counsel appearing for the appellant. The appellant herein Initially instituted O.S.No.426 of 2010 for perpetual injunction against one Narsing Rao (husband of respondent in S.A.No.291 of 2026 and respondent No.2 in S.A.No.292 of 2026) and later the same was renumbered as O.S.No.1250 of 2013. The respondent in S.A.No.291 of 2026 also filed O.S.No.327 of 2011 against the appellant for his eviction from the suit schedule property and for recovery of arrears of rent and mense profits on the ground that initially the rent was Rs.2,000/- p.m. and thereafter it was enhanced to Rs.15,000/- in the year 2010, and that the appellant is irregular in payment of rent, and that the appellant is not keeping the premises in good and tenantable condition i.e. more particularly damaging walls, the flooring because of heavy metals and hardware items thrown on the floor. The learned Trial Court clubbed both the suits and passed common judgment dated 22.10.2021 while partly decreeing O.S.No.327 of 2011 directed the appellant to vacate the suit schedule property and deliver vacant possession to the respondents and dismissed claim of respondents with regard to arrears of rent. The learned Trial Court dismissed O.S.No.1250 of 2013 filed by the appellant.	Transferred to the I.O. folder before making corrections

The learned counsel appearing for the appellant framed the substantial questions of law framed at (A) to (D) of the Grounds of Appeal requires consideration.

On the other hand, Sri Pawan Kumar Agarwal, learned counsel appearing for the respondents vehemently opposes the admission of the Appeals contending that based on the substantial questions, no case has been made out and that the concurrent findings of both learned Trial Court and the First Appellate Court are well reasoned, and that the Second Appeals, in the absence of substantial questions of law, deserves to be dismissed.

Learned counsel for the respondent seeks time to place the Rulings for consideration of admission as well as interim order, based on the substantial law framed by the appellant.

Post on 21.08.2026

GPK,J
vsv