## **HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH:: AMARAVATI**

MAIN CASE No: CMA.No.104 of 2023

## PROCEEDING SHEET

DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
20.03.2023	DVSS, J & SV,J	
	After hearing the learned counsel for the	
	The trial Court relied upon the order passed in	
	W.P.No.15418 of 2022 to hold that	
	constructions being made are not illegal	
	constructions, since there is an order by this	
	Court. However in the affidavit filed in support	
	of the interlocutory application, it is clearly	
	avoid that this writ petition has been	
	withdrawn but the construction was	
	continued. This aspect is not noticed by the	
	Trial Court. The suit also contains a prayer for	
	construction already made.	
	Learned counsel for the appellant argues	
	that construction is not completed and that	
	when the suit is filed, construction was at a	
	preliminary stage.	
	To ascertain this issue, this court is of	
	the opinion that an Advocate Commissioner is	
	to be appointed to inspect the suit schedule	
	property and also the current stage of	
	construction.	
	Sri P. Sai Surya Teja, learned Advocate	
	is appointed as an advocate commissioner and	
		After hearing the learned counsel for the appellant, this Court notices that of all the points made, one issue deserves consideration. The trial Court relied upon the order passed in W.P.No.15418 of 2022 to hold that constructions being made are not illegal constructions, since there is an order by this Court. However in the affidavit filed in support of the interlocutory application, it is clearly avoid that this writ petition has been withdrawn but the construction was continued. This aspect is not noticed by the Trial Court. The suit also contains a prayer for mandatory injunction for removal of the construction already made.  Learned counsel for the appellant argues that construction is not completed and that when the suit is filed, construction was at a preliminary stage.  To ascertain this issue, this court is of the opinion that an Advocate Commissioner is to be appointed to inspect the suit schedule property and also the current stage of construction.  Sri P. Sai Surya Teja, learned Advocate

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		his fee is fixed tentatively at Rs.20,000/ He is	
		directed to inspect the suit schedule property	
		and file a detailed report along with	
		photographs. The inspection should be	
		confined to the constructions that are made in	
		the plaint schedule property.	
		List on 31.03.2023.	
		In the meanwhile, learned counsel for	
		the appellant is permitted to take out personal	
		notice to respondent Nos.1 to 3 by RPAD and	
		file proof of service in the Registry.	
		Advocate commissioner is also given	
		liberty to serve notice on respondent Nos.1 to 3	
		before execution of warrant.	
		DVSS,J SV,J	