

**ORDER BELOW EXH. 07 IN RCS NO. 105/2025**

Plaintiff moved the present application seeking status quo against defendant till they appear and filed their say and WS. Heard advocate for plaintiffs and perused record.

2. According to the plaintiffs they have purchased the suit property from defendant No. 1 and 2 and One Laxman Karbhari Sarvode for consideration by registered sale deed. However, entry of their name was mutated in revenue record. On perusal of entire application of plaintiffs it seems, plaintiffs are resident beyond jurisdiction of this Court i.e. Manmad Tq. Nandgaon Dist. Nashik. Entire pleadings is silent on the point of possession of plaintiffs over suit property. Furthermore, affidavits of adjacent land holder are also not filed on record.

3. It is pertinent to note that, Laxman Sarvode is not made party to the suit. Description of the suit property and four boundaries as pleaded and those mentioned in sale deed of year 2012 filed with Exh.4 are totally different. Most importantly status of the suit property as on today is not brought on record. Nothing is on record, no photographs on record to show the status of the suit property. In the present

..2..

case already notice is issued to defendants as per order below Exh.5. However, summons report are not on record and defendants are also not appear in the present suit. No ground is made out to grant equitable remedy of status-quo ex-parte or to show very purpose of injunction is frstrated by delay. In this backdrop it is not justifiable to issue ad-interim injunction and order of status-quo against defendants without giving them any opportunity of hearing. Therefore, issue urgent notice to defendants as to why status-quo as prayed shall not be granted against them. EP and SB allowed.

Date :05.03.2025.

Place: Vaijapur.

[Smt. V.R. Kulkarni]

3rd Jt. Civil Judge (J.D.),
Vaijapur.