


IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY TWO

:PRESENT:
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE M.GANGA RAO

IA No. 1 OF 2022
IN
CMA NO: 88 OF 2022



Between:

Korukonda Lakshmi Nageswara Rao, S/o. Ramulu, aged 62 years, retired Employee, R/o. D.no.C-51, Desapatrunipalem, Parawada(S.O.), Visakhapatnam-21.

...Petitioner/Appellant/Plaintiff

AND

1. Nagisetty Srinivasa, S/o. Late Dernudu, aged 33 years, R/o. D.No.12-44, R.R.Venkatapuram, Sri Krishna Nagar, Visakhapatnam.
 2. Rayi Mutyala Rao, S/o. Late Ramulu, aged 46 years, R/o. Gallavanipalem Hamlet, Aganampudi, Gajuwaka, Visakhapatnam.
 3. Rayi Kanaka Rao, S/o. Late Ramulu, aged 46 years, R/o. Gallavanipalem Hamlet, Aganampudi, Gajuwaka, Visakhapatnam.
 4. Rayi Appala Narasamma, (Died)
 5. Pyla Swami Naidu, S/o.China Rajulu, Aged 43 years, Employees in Visakhapatnam Steel Plant, R/o. Quarters No.341/F, Sector 6, Ukkunagaram, Visakhapatnam.
 6. Gokada Nagamani, W/o. Srinu (D/o. Late Rayi Kanaka Rao), Aged 29 years, Household duties, R/o. D.No.139/5, Aganampudi, Kondavalasa Colony, Visakhapatnam.
- (2 to 6 not necessary parties)

...Respondents/Defendants

Counsel for the Petitioner :SRI G RAMA GOPAL

Counsel for the Respondents: ----

Petition under 39 Rule 1 & 2 CPC r/w Section 151 of CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant Ad-interim Injunction restraining the 1st respondent from, raising any construction over the Petition schedule property / suit schedule property, pending disposal of CMA No.88 of 2022, on the file of the High Court.

The court while directing issue of notice to the Respondents herein to show cause as to why this application should not be complied with, made the following order.(The receipt of this order will be deemed to be the receipt of notice in the case). The Court made the following;

ORDER:

“Learned counsel for the Appellant submits that if the interim injunction is not granted and if the respondents are allowed to make construction of residential flats and if they sold away to the third parties, there is every possibility of multiplicity of proceedings.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions of the learned counsel and on perusal of the material record and photographs, this Court is prima facie satisfied that the petitioner has shown sufficient cause for grant of interim injunction.

Accordingly, there shall be Ad-interim injunction restraining the 1st respondent from raising any construction over the suit schedule property, pending disposal of the CMA.”

Sd/- M. SURYANADHA REDDY
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

For ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

To,

1. The District Judge, Visakhapatnam, Visakhapatnam District ((In Duplicate with a copy of injunction to be served on the respondents and return the same)
2. The III Additional District Judge, Gajuwaka, Visakhapatnam.
3. Nagisetty Srinivasa, S/o. Late Dernudu, R/o. D.No.12-44, R.R.Venkatapuram, Sri Krishna Nagar, Visakhapatnam. (by RPAD- along with a copy of petition and memorandum of grounds)
4. One CC to Sri. G Rama Gopal, Advocate [OPUC]
5. One spare copy.

MSB

HIGH COURT

MGR,J

DATED:23/03/2022

ORDER

**IA NO.1 OF 2022
IN
CMA.No.88 of 2022**

AD- INTERIM INJUNCTION

