
(2014) 03 AP CK 0001

In the Andhra Pradesh High Court

Case No : Civil Revision Petition No. 908 of 2014

Gadupudi Raghuramaiah

APPELLANT

Vs

Madineni Eswaramma

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 26-03-2014

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2014) 03 AP CK 0001

Hon'ble Judges : B. Chandra Kumar, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : T.C. Krishnan, Advocate for the Appellant

Judgement

B. Chandra Kumar, J.—This revision has been filed seeking a direction to the Principal Junior Civil Judge, Gudur to pass orders in I.A. No. 593 of 2013 in I.A. No. 39 of 2013 in O.S. No. 16 of 2013, which is filed for grant of police aid.

2. The brief facts of the faces are as follows:

The revision petitioners herein are the plaintiffs and they filed suit in O.S. No. 16 of 2013 for permanent injunction. They also filed I.A. No. 39 of 2013 for interim injunction and the Court below granted ad-interim ex-parte temporary injunction in favour of the petitioners/plaintiffs on 30.01.2013 and that the same is being extended from time to time and is in force. It is further contended that the petitioners raised sugar cane crop in the schedule property and the same is coming up for harvesting, but the respondents have violated the orders dt. 30.01.2013 and obstructing the petitioners from harvesting the sugar cane crop. Subsequently, the petitioners filed I.A. No. 593 of 2013 seeking a direction to the Station House Officer, Podalakur Police Station, to give police aid to the petitioners to implement the ad-interim injunction orders referred to above, but the Court below has not passed orders yet. Hence they filed the revision seeking a direction to expeditiously dispose of the said petition.

3. Heard the learned counsel for the revision petitioner.

4. As seen from the docket proceedings, the petition in I.A. No. 593 of 2013 was filed for police aid on 10.12.2013 and it is been adjourned from time to time.

5. When there is a complaint that the injunction order has been violated by the respondents by trespassing into the suit land, the Courts have to visualize the urgency in the matter. Every effort has to be made to see that such applications are dealt with expeditiously and willful disobedience should not be tolerated. Such kind of applications should not be dealt casually and should not be adjourned to longer dates. If the injunction orders are violated without any due regard to the orders of the Court, there will be no respect to the Court orders, therefore, necessary police aid should be given as and when the circumstances warrant. However, if any application for vacate injunction is pending then both such applications i.e., vacate petition, application alleging violation of injunction order and police aid petition should be disposed of simultaneously. As and when such grievances are expressed by the parties, the Courts have to dispose of the same urgently, preferable at least within 30 days from the date of filing of such application.

6. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition is disposed of, directing the Principal Junior Civil Judge, Gudur to dispose of I.A. No. 593 of 2013 in I.A. No. 39 of 2013 in O.S. No. 16 of 2013 in accordance with law within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. However, in the circumstances, there is no order as to costs.

7. As a sequel, the miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, in this revision shall stand closed.