

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd. Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

**Printed For:** 

Date: 31/10/2025

## (2012) 2 ALD 454

# **Andhra Pradesh High Court**

Case No: Civil Revision Petition No. 2727 of 2011

Marella Radhakrishna APPELLANT

Vs

Kallam Peri Reddy RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Dec. 23, 2011

Citation: (2012) 2 ALD 454

Hon'ble Judges: K.G. Shankar, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: B. Chinnapa Reddy, for the Appellant; B. Parameswar Rao, for the Respondent

Final Decision: Allowed

## **Judgement**

#### @JUDGMENTTAG-ORDER

### K.G. Shankar

1. The plaintiff laid O.S. No. 53 of 2010 on the file of the I Additional Senior Civil Judge, Guntur. The suit was decreed. The defendant preferred

appeal before the District Court, Guntur. There was a delay of 24 days in filing the appeal. The defendant filed I.A. No. 5306 of 2010 to condone

delay in filing the appeal.

2. The delay was allegedly since the defendant was suffering from typhoid. The learned District Judge wrote a detailed and an exhaustive order and

considered it appropriate not to condone the delay. Assailing the same, the present revision is laid by the defendant.

3. I consider that the attitude of the Courts in the matters of condonation of delay is and should be very liberal. Added to it, there was a delay of

24 days only. In view of the length of the delay, I deem it appropriate to condone the delay.

4. Consequently, this revision is allowed. The delay of 24 days in filing the appeal before the Appellate Court is condoned. The appellate Court

shall check and register the appeal if it is otherwise in order. This revision is accordingly allowed. No costs.