

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT
AMARILLO

Praveen Kumar Yeddula v. Aparna Yeddula

Nos. 07-26-00023-CV and 07-26-00024-CV (Tex. App.—Amarillo May 18, 2026) · No. Nos. 07-26-00023-CV
and 07-26-00024-CV · Decided May 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals, Seventh District, affirmed orders denying Praveen Kumar Yeddula’s bill of review and granting Aparna Yeddula’s motion to enforce a divorce decree. The court held that alleged duplication of mortgage amounts constituted intrinsic rather than extrinsic fraud, and that Praveen’s failure to pursue timely remedies and inability to establish lack of fault defeated his bill-of-review claim. The court also upheld appointment of a receiver to sell the marital homestead because the sale enforced an owelty-of-partition award authorized by the Texas Constitution.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Alex Yarbrough; Parker, C.J.; Doss, J.; Yarbrough, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo
DECIDED	May 18, 2026
DOCKET	Nos. 07-26-00023-CV and 07-26-00024-CV
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Praveen Kumar Yeddula appealed the denial of his bill of review, the denial of his oral motion to stay enforcement pending appeal, and the granting of Aparna Yeddula's motion to enforce the divorce decree and appoint a receiver to sell the marital homestead.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The denial of a bill of review, rulings on post-divorce enforcement or clarification motions, and appointment of a receiver are reviewed for abuse of discretion. The appellate court presumes the trial court acted properly unless the record affirmatively shows arbitrary or unreasonable action or action without reference to guiding rules or principles.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion; precedential effect is not otherwise specified in the source.

PARTIES

Praveen Kumar Yeddula v. Aparna Yeddula

TOPICS

divorce

equitable distribution

family law procedure

remedies

appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

family law

civil procedure

appellate procedure

real estate

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court abused its discretion by denying Praveen's bill of review based on alleged fraud in the divorce decree's property division.
2. Whether the alleged duplication of mortgage debt constituted extrinsic fraud supporting a bill of review.
3. Whether Praveen's failure to appear at the divorce hearing and failure to pursue a timely motion for new trial or appeal constituted fault or negligence barring bill-of-review relief.
4. Whether the appointment of a receiver to sell the homestead violated Praveen's constitutional homestead rights.
5. Whether the trial court abused its discretion by enforcing the divorce decree's property division and appointing a receiver.

HOLDINGS

1. Alleged fraud contained within the four corners of the divorce decree and directed to the merits of the property division is intrinsic fraud, not extrinsic fraud, and therefore does not support an equitable bill of review.
2. A party seeking a bill of review must establish a meritorious claim or defense, prevention from presenting it by official mistake or the opposing party's fraud, accident, or wrongful act, and the absence of fault or negligence; Praveen failed to satisfy those requirements.
3. Appointment of a receiver to sell the homestead pursuant to an owelty-of-partition obligation imposed in the divorce decree did not violate Praveen's constitutional homestead rights.
4. The trial court did not abuse its discretion by enforcing the divorce decree or appointing a receiver to sell the residence because it retained jurisdiction to enforce the property division and Praveen presented no evidence showing that enforcement was improper.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"An equitable bill of review is a direct attack on a judgment that is no longer appealable or subject to a motion for new trial." (5)

"Praveen did not present evidence of extrinsic fraud as required. Instead, he presented evidence of intrinsic fraud because the fraud was within the four corners of the divorce decree, and such fraud does not support a bill of review." (7)

“Thus, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in granting her motion and appointing a receiver to sell the residence.” (9)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties married in 1998 and separated in 2018. Praveen filed a general denial in the divorce proceeding but did not appear at the final hearing, and the trial court awarded him the marital homestead subject to Aparna's \$140,000 owelty-of-partition interest and ordered the property sold if the parties could not agree on a sales price. Praveen received the decree, retained counsel, and initially pursued post-judgment remedies, but counsel later informed the court that Praveen no longer wished to pursue a motion for new trial or appeal. After Praveen failed to sell the property or pay Aparna, the trial court enforced the decree and appointed a receiver. Praveen alleged that mortgages had been counted twice and inflated Aparna's equalization payment, but the appellate court characterized that alleged fraud as intrinsic and found that Praveen's own failure to appear and failure to pursue timely remedies barred bill-of-review relief.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Aparna Yeddula filed for divorce in 2022. Praveen filed a general denial but did not appear at the divorce hearing, and the trial court entered a final decree dividing the marital estate and awarding Aparna a \$140,000 interest secured by an owelty-of-partition encumbrance. After Praveen did not pursue a timely motion for new trial or appeal, Aparna sought enforcement of the property division and appointment of a receiver. Praveen later filed a bill of review alleging extrinsic fraud concerning duplicated mortgage calculations. The trial court denied the bill of review, denied a stay, granted enforcement, and appointed a receiver; the court of appeals affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Frost Nat'l Bank v. Fernandez, 315 S.W.3d 494, 504 (Tex. 2010)
- Valdez v. Hollenbeck, 465 S.W.3d 217, 226 (Tex. 2015)
- King Ranch, Inc. v. Chapman, 118 S.W.3d 742, 751-52 (Tex. 2003)
- Bettwieser v. Jeffery, No. 05-18-01266-CV, 2020 Tex. App. LEXIS 6097, at *10-*11 (Tex. App.—Dallas Aug. 3, 2020, no pet.) (mem. op.)
- Beshears v. Beshears, 423 S.W.3d 493, 499 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2014, no pet.)
- Spiritas v. Davidoff, 459 S.W.3d 224, 231 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2015, no pet.)
- Yeddula v. Yeddula, No. 07-26-00023-CV, 2026 Tex. App. LEXIS 1187, at *2 (Tex. App.—Amarillo Feb. 6, 2026, order)