

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10171 OF 2014
(Arising out of S.L.P.(C) No.11726 of 2011)

(s)	Srirama Warehouses Thr. Partner	Appellant
	Versus	
t(s)	Edulakanti Narasimha Reddy (D) Thr. Lrs. and Others	Respondent

O R D E R

Leave granted.

Heard learned counsel for the appellant.

None has

appeared for the respondent.

stated for

The facts which are essential to be

appellant,

disposal of the present appeal are that the

together

Srirama Warehouses, instituted O.S. No.295 of 2006 (old O.S. No.778 of 1992), for recovery of Rs.1,21,368/-, with interest at the rate of twenty-four per cent from the date of institution of suit till the date of realisation and for costs of the suit. In the said suit, late Edulakanti

ti

Narasimha Reddy was the defendant.

Signature Not Verified

One, C. Manohar Reddy, had filed O.S. No.101 of

Digitally signed by
Chetan Kumar
Date: 2014.11.22
12:41:02 IST
Reason:

2004, for recovery of Rs.46,49,260/- together with interest

at the rate of twenty-four per cent per annum, against the

legal representative of Edulakanti Narasimha

Reddy, the
SLP(C) 11726/11

respondent herein. It is not in dispute that C. Manohar Reddy, P. Chengal Reddy and S. Narsimha Reddy, are the partners and were carrying on business under the name and style of Srirama Warehouses. The appellant, C. Manohar Reddy, undisputedly is one of the partners.

The learned trial Judge tried both the suits together and dismissed O.S. No.295 of 2006 and partly decreed O.S. No.101 of 2004. The present appellant preferred CCCA No.163 of 2009. The legal representatives of Edulakanti Narasimha Reddy preferred CCCA No.164 of 2009.

Submission of learned counsel for the appellant is that when both the appeals were filed against the common judgement, it was advisable on the part of the High Court to hear both the appeals together and dispose of them by a singular judgement. It is urged by him that against the

common judgement, when two appeals are preferred, it is always requisite that for sense of propriety they should be heard together, otherwise there would be likelihood of anomaly. Learned counsel would contend that the appeal preferred by the legal heirs of Edulakanti Narasimha Reddy is pending before the High Court.

In view of the aforesaid, we think it appropriate to allow the appeal, set aside the impugned judgement and remit it to the High Court to be heard along with CCCA No.164 of 2009 and be disposed of by a common judgement. We hereby SLP(C) 11726/11

3

make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

The appeal is, accordingly, allowed. There shall be no order as to costs.

.....J.
(Dipak Misra)

