

IN THE COURT OF VACATION CIVIL JUDGE, CAMP AT KOVVUR

Dr. Yeedu Srinivasa Rao

In the Court of : Vacation Civil Judge :: Judge, Family Court-cum-VII Additional District
Judge, West Godavari, Eluru

A Diary Dated: 21.05.2026

S.No.	Case Type	Case Proceedings
1.	OS 17/26	Issue summons to defendants, call on 22.06.26.
2.	IA 77/26 in OS 17/26	Issue notice to Caveator and other respondents, call on 22.06.26.
3.	CP 21/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
4.	CP 22/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
5.	CP 23/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
6.	CP 24/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
7.	CP 25/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
8.	CP 26/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
9.	OS/26 SR 2/26	Returned
10.	OS/26 in SR 156/26	Returned
11.	OS/26 in SR 132/26	Returned
12.	OS/26 in SR 169/26	Returned
13.	OS/26 in SR 166/26	Returned

**Vacation Civil Judge,
Family Court-cum-VII Additional District
Judge, West Godavari, Eluru
Camp at Kovvur**

IN THE COURT OF VACATION CIVIL JUDGE, CAMP AT TADEPALLIGUDEM

Dr. Yeedu Srinivasa Rao

In the Court of : Vacation Civil Judge :: Judge, Family Court-cum-VII Additional District Judge,
West Godavari, Eluru

A Diary Dated: 20.05.2026

S.No.	Case Type	Case Proceedings
1.	OS 15/2016	Issue suit summons to defendant through court and speed post by 22.06.2026.
2.	I.A.No.65/2026 in O.S.No.15/2026	<p>Heard. This application filed U/Order 39 Rule 1 & 2 of CPC seeking to grant ad-interim Injunction directing the defendant/respondent not to alienate either the entire plaint schedule property or any of the item of the plaint schedule property in any manner pending disposal of the main suit.</p> <p>I have perused the petition and contents of the affidavit. This is a suit for partition of the plaint schedule property into two equal shares and to allot one share to the plaintiffs/petitioners. The theory of the petitioners/plaintiffs is such that on 21.12.1969, the father of the defendant/respondent and the grand-father of the 1st plaintiff/1st petitioner and the father-in-law of 2nd petitioner, which is alleging to have been acquired by virtue of a registered sale deed and the schedule properties are said to be in joint possession of the plaintiffs and defendant and the petitioners/plaintiffs denied on certain registered documents of the year 1969 and 1983, which show the prima facie case to go for trial, inasmuch as the Seelam Lakshmi Narayana died on 16.01.2007, as which from the copy of death certificate of him, which is dated 16.012007. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners/plaintiffs that the defendant is trying to alienate the plaint schedule property and if he is succeeded, it would cause irreparable loss to the petitioners/plaintiffs and therefore injunction is highly essential.</p> <p>As seen from the dicta in Boya Kistamma and others Vs Boya Suri, 2026(1) ALT 42 where in the High Court of Andhra Pradesh held that the petitioner/plaintiff who seeks injunction must show the essential ingredients of U/Order 39 Rule 1 & 2 of CPC; in another case of J.Bala Krishna Raju Vs J.Radha Krishna Raju, 2014 (4) ALT 570, The Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh held that in an application of temporary injunction, the initial onus of proof</p>

		<p>as well as the legal burden to prove the prima facie case.</p> <p>Curiously enough, following the dicta in A.Venkata Subbayya Naidu Vs S.Chellappan & other, AR 2000 Supreme Court 3032 and Dalpat Kumar and another Vs Prahlad Singh and others, AIR 1993 SC 276 B, as the petitioners/plaintiffs, in this present case on hand, show strong prima facie case and there is a danger of alienation of the plaint schedule properties and if it is done, it would cause irreparable loss to the petitioners/plaintiffs and therefore this is a case in which ad-interim injunction must be granted restraining the alienation of plaint schedule property till 22.06.2026. However, this court makes it clear that further extension of injunction would be only on hearing on both sides.</p> <p>In the result, ad-interim injunction is granted restraining the alienation of plaint schedule property till 22.06.2026. However, this court makes it clear that further extension of injunction would be only on hearing on both sides. The petitioners/plaintiffs shall comply with Order 39 Rule 3A of CPC. Issue urgent notice to the respondent/defendant on payment of process call on 22.06.2026.</p>
3.	OS 16/2016	Issue suit summons to defendant through court and speed post by 22.06.2026.
4.	I.A.No.67/2026 in O.S.16/2026	<p>Heard.</p> <p>This application is filed U/Order 38 Rule 5 of CPC seeking to attach the petition schedule property before judgment and the property is situated in Warangal District, Telangana State. The learned counsel for the petitioner/plaintiff submits that the property can be attach before the judgment by way of precepts by invoking jurisdiction U/Sec 136 code of Civil Procedure 1908, a fortiori, the respondent/defendant are said to have obtained hand loan of Rs.50,00,000/- for the purpose of acquiring rice mill property/petition schedule property at Warangal and did not repay the debt to the petitioners/plaintiffs, in spite of repeated demands and the respondents/defendants are trying to alienate the petition schedule property with dishonest intention to defraud petitioner/plaintiff and to delay the execution of decree that may be passed against the respondents/defendants. This court is satisfy with the averments of the affidavit and the essential ingredients U/Order 38 Rule 5 of CPC are clearly attracted and this is a case in which attachment before judgment must be ordered, if the respondents/defendants fail to furnish</p>

		security as ordered infra, invoking the jurisdiction in U/Sec 136 of CPC by way of precepts inasmuch the petition schedule property is situated out of the territorial jurisdiction of this court. Therefore, the respondents/defendants are hereby directed to furnish security for the suit amount within 72 hours and shall show cause why they should not furnish security for the suit amount. In the meanwhile, conditional attachment is ordered and U/Order 38 Rule 5 r/w 136 of CPC by way of precepts. Issue conditional attachment before judgment warrant by way of precepts U/Order 38 Rule 5 r/w 136 of CPC on payment of process and issue urgent notices to the respondents/defendants on process. Call by 22.06.2026.
5.	CP 13/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
6.	CP 14/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
7.	CP 15/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
8.	CP 16/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
9.	CP 17/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
10.	CP 18/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
11.	CP 19/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
12.	CP 20/26	Lodged, watch 90 days
13.	OS/26 in SR 132/26	Returned
14.	OS/26 in SR 129/26	Returned
15.	OS/26 in SR 123/26	Returned

Vacation Civil Judge,
Family Court-cum-VII Additional District Judge,
West Godavari, Eluru
Camp at Tadepalligudem