

Order below Exh. 6 in R. C. S. No. 32/2022

Perused application and documents filed by the plaintiff. Heard the learned advocate for plaintiff Shri. M. C. Pogale. It appears from the documents filed along with list Exh. 4 that the plaintiff is in possession of the suit property. Also, it appears that the defendant no. 1 issued notice to the plaintiff for removal of encroachment made by him. However, said notice does not indicate as to what extent and from which side, the alleged encroachment is made by the plaintiff. As per contentions of the plaintiff that if defendant no. 1 demolish the suit property on the basis of said notice, he will suffer irrepaerable loss. Therefore, it deems necessary to protect an interest of the plaintiff in the suit property. In my considered opinion, object of granting status-quo order would be defeated by the delay. The plaintiff has prima facie made out the case. Hence, I pass the following order-

ORDER

1. Defendant no. 1 is directed to maintain status-quo in respect of the suit property till filling of its say to Exh. 5.
2. The plaintiff to comply the Order 39, Rule 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Deori
Date : 14.10.2022.

(V. V. Khulape)
Civil judge, J. D. Deori.

Extract of Order below Exh. 5 in R.C.S.No. 137/2013

Laxman Bhangare Vs. Chandrakant Nawale and others.

O R D E R

1. Ad-interim injunction against defendants is hereby granted and defendants are hereby temporarily restrained from causing any obstruction or digging the suit property or making any type of construction and interference to the possession of the plaintiff over the suit property bearing city survey no. 1039 and 1041 situated at village Rajur, Tal. Akole, Dist. Ahmednagar in any manner until further order.
2. The plaintiff to comply the Order 39, Rule 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure.
3. E. P. and S. B. allowed. Returnable on 11-10-2013.

Akole.
Date : 27.09.2013.

Sd/-xxx
(J. R. Mulani)
Jt. Civil judge, J. D. Akole.