IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE :: JANGAON

PRESENT: SMT. B. PRATHIMA
Prl. Sessions Judge
Jangaon

Wednesday, the 29th day of April, 2026

CMA 5 of 2026
in
I.A.No.67 of 2026
in
O.S.No.26 of 2026

Between:

1. Butreddy Ravinder Reddy
2. Butreddy Padma

… Appellants/Respondents/Defendants

AND

Butreddy Malla Reddy

…Respondent/Petitioner/Plaintiff

This Petition having come before me for final hearing in the presence of **Sri G. Naga Rajeshwar Rao,** Advocate for the Appellants, **Sri A. Bikshapathi,** Advocate for the Respondent, and the matter having stood over for consideration till this day, the Court made the following :

-: O R D E R :-

1. This CMA is filed by the respondents defendants aggrieved by ad-interim injunction granted by learned Trial Judge on 30-03-2026 in IA 67/2026 in OS 26/2026 and which is said to be extended from time to time by the learned trial Judge.

2. Along with this CMA, the appellant filed interlocutory application U/O LXI Rule 5 CPC vide IA SR 1480 of 2026 seeking to suspend or grand stay order of Ad-interim injunction in IA 67/2026 in OS 26/2026.

3. Heard both side counsel.

4. The point for determination is -

Whether Appellant/Respondent is entitled for setting aside the order dated 30.03.2026 in IA 67/2026 in OS 26/2026 passed by the AJCJ, Jangaon, as prayed for?

Point:

5. Notice of this CMA and IA were given to learned counsel for respondent in the CMA who is counsel for petitioner plaintiff in IA 67/2026. As learned counsel for appellant sought for hearing in IA SR 1480 of 2026 and sought for suspension of order injunction petition vide IA 67/2026 in OS 26/2026. This Court directed both side to advance arguments in the main CMA itself as the impugned order is only an ad-interim injunction order and not orders passed on merits and also for the reason that the interlocutory application is coming for enquiry.

6. Learned counsel for appellant submitted that the ad-interim injunction order granted against the appellant is causing much inconvenience and as appellants is restrained from visiting mother-in-law of 2nd appellant and mother of 1st appellant in her fag end of her life, it is just and necessary to set-aside the ad-interim injunction order to enable the appellants from visiting her in the suit schedule house.

7. It is not disputed by the learned counsel for respondent petitioner plaintiff that the 1st appellant/1st defendant is his own brother. Learned counsel for

respondent/ plaintiff submitted that they are ready for advancing arguments in IA 67/2026 in OS 26/2026 before the Trial Court.

8. In the circumstance stated above, I hold that giving directions to the learned trial judge for early disposal of the petition after affording an opportunity to both sides to submit in the petition will meet the ends of justice. The point is answered accordingly.

9. **In the result,** the CMA is Disposed with a direction to learned Trial Judge to dispose IA 67/2026 in OS 26/2026 within 15 days from the date of receipt of this Order. Learned Trial Judge shall make every endeavor to dispose the petition after affording an opportunity to both sides to advance their respective arguments in the petition. No Costs.

Typed to dictation by the Stenographer, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court, on this the 29th day of April, 2026.

Sd/-XXX
PRL. DISTRICT JUDGE
JANGAON.

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE
- Nil -

Sd/-XXX-
PRL. DISTRICT JUDGE
JANGAON.