IN THE COURT OF THE JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE: CITY CIVIL COURT AT SECUNDERABAD

O.S.NO.

OF 2008

Setween:

Pramod Chandra Modi S/o late Sri Manilal Modiaged 60 years, occupation: Business, R/o 1-8-169, P.G.Road, Secunderabad.

PLAINTIFF

AND

- A.P.C.P.D.C.L.
 Represented by its Managing Director
 Having their Corporate Office at Singareni Bhavan.
 Red Hills, Hyderabad.
- 2. Asst. Divisional Engineer Operations D.XVIII, James Street City V, Secunderabad.
- 3. Asst. Accounts Officer ERO-VI/Paradise Secunderabad.
- Sri Radheshyam S/o not known to Plaint ff aged about 50 years, Proprietor, M/s.Sailors Inn Restaurant R/o 19/1, Paigah Colony S.P.Road, Secunderated.

DEFENDANTS

PLAINT FILED UNDER SECTION 26 OF C.P.C. SUIT FOR DECLARATION AND INJUNCTION

L. Description of the Plaintiff:

Pramod Chandra Modi S/o late Sri Manilal Modi, aged 60 years, occupation: Business, R/o 1-8-169, P.G.Road, Secunderabad.

The address for service of all notices, summons and process etc. on the plaintiff is an mentioned above and of his counsel Sri.C.Balagopal, Smc.Ameerunnsa Begum, Sri.K.Vijaya Saradhi, Sri.C.V.Chandra Mouli and Y. Bizapathy, Advocates, Flat No.103, Harivilla Apartments: Road No.11. West Marredpally, Secunderabad.

- 1). Description of the Defendants:
 - 1. A.P.C.P.D.C.L. Represented by its Managing Director, Having their Corporate Office at Gingareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad.

- 2. Asst. Divisional Engineer, Operations D.XVIII, James Street, City V, Secunderabad.
- 3. Asst. Accounts Officer, ERO-VI/Paradise, Secunderabad.
- Sri Radheshyam S/o not known to Plaintiff, aged about 50 years, Proprietor, M/s.Sailors Inn Restaurant, R/o 19/1, Paigah Colony, S.P.Road, Secunderabad.

The address for service of all notices, summons and process etc. on the defendants are as mentioned above.

III. <u>Facts of the case</u>:

- 1. The Plaintiff is the owner of the premises bearing No.1-8-169, P.G.Road, Secunderabad. In the year 1991, one M/s.Sailors Into Restaurant the 4th Defendant obtained the above premises on lease from the Plaintiff and was running a Restaurant in the said premises. The said tenant vacated the premises in the year 1907 and handed over peaceful possession of the same to the Plaintiff herein and Plaintiff has let out the same to a new tenant.
- 2. On 26.09.2008 the Plaintiff received a letter from the Defendant No.2 stating that a sum of Rs.3,75,948/- was due from the above said M/s.Sailors Inn Restaurant towards a case booked on 27.3.1993 with regard pilferage of electricity. After receipt of the above said letter on 26.07.2008, the Plaintiff made a representation to the Defendant No.2 vide letter dated 6.8.2006 stating that the dispute is between the old tenant of the plaintiff, i.e., 4th Defendant. As a owner of the suit schedule property the Plaintiff is no way connected with the above said disputes and demanding the above sum under letter dated 26.07.2008 is illegat and the Defendants 1 to 3 have no right to disconnect the electricity supply to the suit schedule property.
- 3. Subsequently, the Plaintiff contacted the former tenant and the said tenant vide letter dated 18.8.2008 informed the Plaintiff that it has won the case against the Defendants and the Competent court has held that there was no tampering or pilferage of

electricity and he is taking steps for the refund of the money he has already paid to the department and also clearly stated that he was not due any amount to the Defendants 1 to 3. Subsequently, again the Plaintiff received a letter from Defendant No.3 stating that an amount of Rs.61,810.05 is due from earlier tenant and pay the same immediately. The officials of the Defendants onally threatened the Plaintiff to pay the above said sum immediately otherwise, electricity supply will be disconnected to the suit schedule property.

- 4. The Plaintiff respectfully submit that in any event the Plaintiff is no way concerned with the dispute between the Defendants 1 to 3 and the 4th defendant and on the ground of dues from the earlier tenant, the Defendants 1 to 3 cannot disconnect the electricity supply to the suit schedule property. The Plaintiff is regularly paying the bills. Therefore, the Plaintiff is constrained to file the suit for declaration that the notice dated 26.07.2008 and 26.09.2008 as null and void and the proposed action of the disconnection of electricity supply to the suit schedule property is illegal.
- IV. <u>Cause of action</u>: the cause of action for the suit arose on 26.07.2008 when the Defendants 1 to 3 issued the notices and on 26.09.2008 when the officials of the Defendant orally threatened to disconnect the power supply to the premises.
- V. Jurisdiction: The suit is filed for declaration and injunction and the suit schedule premises is situated in Prenderghast Road, Secunderabad, hence this Hon'ble court has jurisdiction to by the suit.

VII. <u>Prayer</u>: The plaintiff prays that this Hon'ble court be pleased to pass a Judgement and Decree in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendants granting the following reliefs:-

- a) To declare that the notices dated 26.07.2008 and 26.09.2008 issued by the Defendants 1 to 3 as null and void;
- b) Consequently grant injunction restraining the Defendants from disconnecting electricity supply to the suit schedule property;
- c) grant the costs of the suit.
- d) and to pass such other relief or reliefs as are just and necessary in the circumstances of the case.

Counsel for Plaintiff SECUNDERABAD

PLAINTIE

Date: 2

29-09-2008

YERIFICATION

I, the Plaintiff above named, do hereby declare that the facts stated above are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, hence verified.

SECUNDERABAD Date: 29-09-2008

PLAINTIFF

SCHEDULE OF PROPERTY

All that premises bearing No. 1-8-169, situated at Prenderghast Road.

SECUNDERABAD Date: 29-09-2008

PLAINTIFF

VERIFICATION

I, the Plaintiff above named, do hereby verify that the above schedule of property is true and correct. hence verified.

SECUNDERABAD Date: 29-09-2008

PLAINTIFF

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

SLNC). Date	Parties	Description of Document
01.	26.07.2008	Def. 2 Plaintiff	Notice
02.	6.8.2008	Flaintiff-Def. 2	Reply of Plaintiff
03.	26.09.2008	Def.3-Plaintiff	Notice
		•	3

SECUNDERABAD Date: 29-09-2008

PLAINTIFF

IN THE COURT OF THE JUNIOR
CIVIL JUDGE:
CITY CIVIL COURT AT
SECUNDERABAD

O.S.NO.

OF 2008

Between:

Pramod Chandra Modi
PLAINTIFF

AND

A.P.C.P.D.C.L. & 3 OTHERS DEFENDANTS

PLAINT

FILED UNDER SECTION 26 OF C.P.C. FOR DECLARATION AND INJUNCTION

Filed on: 29.09.2009

Filed by: Sri.C.Balagopal Advocate 103, Harivillu Apartments Road No.11, West Marredpally, Secunderabad – 500 026. Ph: 64570512

In the Court of	the		
	be seen a second many region and a second of the	and the same of a first district state of the same state of the sa	
Petiveen:	Yο.	of 200	561.0
r enveen :			Plaintiff Petitioner
			Complainant Appellant
On the FF to be both the second deposited from prophylic contractive prophylic contractive prophylical	- Darm Marketin (11 A Mary - Marketin (12 Mary - M		Defendent Respondent
I/We	•	,	Accused
	do hereby appoin	nt and retain	
			-
Advocate/s to apper conduct and prosecute and respect of any application empower my/our Advocate suction matter till all decrepostain the return of Document the said Suit or matter any/our behalf, service of appeal Reference or Revisibis same in Honourable C	d defend the same a for execution of an els to appear in all es or cider are fully ments and draw any and I/V/e do further notice of all or any sion with regard to b	ny decren or order passe miscellaneous proceeding satisfied or adjusted to o y money that might be pa empower my/our Advocate grappeal or petition filed	may be taken in ad therein. I/We gs in the above compromise and ayable to me/us le/s to accept on in any Court or
Certified that the Vakalatnama that the corterdu /Hindi/Telugu to ex appeared perfectly to unde in my presence.	itents of this Vakal ecutant he/she/the erstand the same and	y being unacquainted wi d signed or put his/her/the	nd explained in

Executed on this the ______Day of ______200

ADVOCATE

AT	
No.	of 200
Betsveen:	
	Plaintiff Petitioner
	Appellant Complainant
А	ND
	Defendem Respondem
	Accused

	A L A T
ACC	
ACC	
ACC	
Filed on : Filed By :	EPTED

Advocates Co-operative Society, City Civil Court, Hyderabad. Phone: 2441 8387

IN THE COURT OF THE JUNIOR CIVIL JUDGE: CITY CIVIL COURT AT SECUNDERABAD

LA. No.

of 2008

m

O.S.NO.

OF 2008

Between:

Pramod Chandra Modi

Petitioner/Plaintiff

AND

A.P.C.P.D.C.L. & OTHERS

Respondents/Defendants

TIVACIFIA

I, Pramod Chandra Modi S/o late Sri Manilal Modi, aged 60 years,occ: Business,R/o 1-8-169, F.G.Road, Secunderabad do hereby state affirm on oath as follows:

- 1. I am the Petitioner herein and Plaintiff in the main suit and as such I am well acquainted with the facts deposed hereunder.
- 2. I submit that I am the owner of the premises bearing No.1-8-169, P.G.Road, Secunderabad. In the year 1991, one M/s.Sailors Inn Restaurant the 4th Respondent obtained the above premises on lease from me and was running a Restaurant in the said premises. The said tenant vacated the premises in the year 1997 and handed over peaceful possession of the same to me I let out the same to a new tenant.
- 3. I submit that on 76.09.2008 I received a letter from the Respondent No.2 stating that a sum of Rs.3.75,948/- was due from the above said M/s.Sailors Inn Restaurant towards a case booked on 27.3.1993 with regard pilferage of electricity. After receipt of the above said letter on 26.07.2008, I made a representation to the Respondent No.2 vide letter dated 6.8.2008 stating that the dispute is between the old tenant of me, i.e., 4th Respondent. As a owner of the petition schedule property I am no way connected with the above said disputes and demanding the above sum under letter dated 26.07.2008 is illegal and the Respondents 1 to 3 have no right to disconnect the electricity supply to the petition schedule property.

- 4. I submit that subsequently, I contacted the former tenant and the said tenant vide letter dated 18.8.2008 informed me that it has won the case against the Respondents and the Competent court has held that there was no tampering or pilferage of electricity and he is taking steps for the refund of the money he has already paid to the department and also clearly stated that he was not due any amount to the Respondents 1 to 3. Subsequently, again I received a letter from Respondent No.3 staging that an amount of Rs.61,810.05 is due from earlier tenant and pay the same immediately. The officials of the Respondents or ally threatened me to pay the above said sum immediately otherwise, electricity supply will be disconnected to the petition schedule property.
- 6. I submit that the Respondents 1 to 3 have no right to disconnect the electricity supply to the petition schedule property on the ground that the earlier tenant i.e., 4th Respondent is due amounts to Respondents 1 to 3.1 submit if the electricity supply to the petition schedule premises is disconnected I will be put to serious loss and hardship.
- 7. I submit that I have a strong prima facie case and the balance of convenience is lies in my favour and if no interim injunction is granted as prayed for in the petition the very purpose of filing of the suit will be defeated and I will be put to irreparable loss and injury.

I, therefore pray that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to grant adinterim injunction restraining Respondents 1 to 3 from disconnecting the electricity supply to the petition schedule property and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deems fit and proper under circumstances of the case.

Sworn and signed before me On this the 29th day of September 2008 At Secunderabad,

DEPONENT