



**IN THE COURT OF THE PRL CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC.,
SHAHAPUR.**

PRESENT
SHOBHA, B.Sc. LLB.
Prl.Civil Judge and JMFC.,
Shahapur

Crl Misc No.382/2016

Date of order : 23rd Day of August, 2025

Between:

1. Smt Jyoti W/o Shantkumar Biradar

...Petitioner

-//Versus//-

1. Shantkumar S/o Veerantappa Biradar and Ors.

...Respondent

IA No.9

1. Shantkumar S/o Veerantappa Biradar and Ors

...Applicant.

-//Versus//-

1. Smt Jyoti W/o Shantkumar Biradar

... Opponent.

=====

Applicant by Sri. YSY Advocate

Opponent by Sri. RND Advocate

=====

Provision under which the application is filed	U/sec 91 of Cr.PC
The date on which the application is filed.	02.08.2025



Number of the application	IA No.9
The date on which the objections are filed	12.08.2025
The date on which the orders were passed on the said application	23.08.2025

**ORDER ON IA No.9 FILED
U/SEC.91 OF CR.PC**

Respondent has filed IA No.9 U/sec 91 of Cr.P.C with a prayer to direct the CDPO Shahapur and CPI Shahapur to conduct panchanama in respect of vehicle bearing No.KA-33-M-9178 Ford India Pvt Ltd Ecosport 1.5 (d) Tatanium Mt and two floor House bearing No.54-579-684 (Old No.54-11-25) of Ward No.16 measuring 30 X 40 in land Sy No.311 and 31/2 of village Rakamgera to ascertain the ownership of petitioner over the same by contending that, petitioner during her cross examination has denied that, she is the owner of vehicle bearing No.KA-33-M-9178 and House bearing No.No.54-579-684 (Old No.54-11-25). In order to ascertain the ownership of the above properties, it is necessary to direct the CDPO and CPI Yadgir to verify and file the documents in respect of the above properties for proper adjudication of the matter.

2. On the other hand, petitioner has filed objections to the above application by contending that, respondent has filed application under Information Act before City Municipal Office Shahapur, but not sought for khata extract of house, but he has



filed application for panchanama, construction permission and information as to who is constructing house and why action is not taken, the respondent has filed this application to drag on the matter and prayed to reject the application.

3. Heard.

4. The points arise for my consideration are as follows:

Points

1. Whether the applicant has made out grounds to allow the application?

2. What order?

5. My findings on the above points as under:

Point No.1: Negative

Point No.2 As per final order,

REASONS

6. Point No.1:- The respondent has filed this application with a prayer to direct the CDPO Shahapur and CPI Yadgir to ascertain the ownership of vehicle bearing No.KA-33-M-9178 Ford India Pvt Ltd Ecosport 1.5 (d) Tatanium Mt and two floor House bearing No.54-579-684 (Old No.54-11-25) of Ward No.16 measuring 30 X 40 in land Sy No.311 and 31/2 of village Rakamgera and to produce the same before the court, but I am of the opinion that, the respondent would have obtained the certified copies from the concerned authority and filed before this



court, it is stated that, under the RTI information was sought and when no information was gathered respondent would have preferred and appeal, but he has filed this present application seeking the information from CDPO and CPI Yadgir for drawing of panchanama and to verify as to who is the owner which is not maintainable, hence I answer point No.1 in ***Negative***.

7. Point No.2:-In view of reasons on point No.1, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

IA No.9 filed U/sec.91 of Cr.P.C is hereby
rejected.

No order as to costs.

(Directly dictated to the Stenographer on computer, corrected and then pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 23rd day of August, 2025)

(Shobha)
Prl Civil Judge and JMFC.
Shahapur