



R.C.S. No.134 of 2025  
CNRNo.MHBU170012402025  
Vinod Salve Vs. Mirabai Sonune

**ORDER BELOW EXH.06**  
**(Dt.13.03.2026)**

**01.** By this application plaintiff sought ad interim ex parte temporary injunction restraining defendant from causing any sort of interference into the use and enjoyment of the suit property by the plaintiff.

**02.** Defendant appeared and sought time to file written statement and say. Defendant did not file say to this application. Therefore, by an order dt.11.03.2026 this application is proceeding without say of defendant.

**03.** Today, plaintiff as well as defendant present. Learned advocates for both the sides also present. Say is not filed by the defendant to this application. Defendant sought time to file say. However, as no say order is passed on 11.03.2026, that application is rejected. However, the notes of written arguments, on this application are filed by the defendant at Exh.11.

**04.** Perused application. It is supported by an affidavit of the plaintiff. Heard, Shri. S. V. Awachar, learned advocate for the plaintiff / applicant. Perused the documents placed on record by the plaintiff. Perused notes of written arguments at Exh.11, filed by the defendant. Heard, Shri. B. S. Dongardive, learned advocate for the defendant.

**05.** It is the contention of the plaintiff that he has purchased the suit property from Girish Sonune, Sindhu Sonune, Shital Sonune and Sulbha Sonune by way of registered sale deed. The defendant has no concern, what so ever with the suit property. However, the defendant is causing obstruction into the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property by the plaintiff.

**06.** It is the defence of the defendant that Girish Sonune, Sindhu Sonune, Shital Sonune and Sulbha Sonune, i.e. the vendors of the plaintiff had no right to alienate the suit property to the plaintiff. As the sale in favour of the plaintiff itself is illegal, the plaintiff cannot be held to be legal owner in possession of the suit property. It is further submitted that another suit (RCS No.142 of 2025) in respect of this property is pending in this court. That be taken into consideration.

07. It is important to note here that the defendant has not denied the fact that the plaintiff has purchased suit property by way of registered sale deed. Whether the vendor of the plaintiff had any right to alienate suit property to plaintiff or not, is a question which will be decided after the parties lead their respective evidence. As of now, if the plaintiff has purchased the suit property by way of registered sale deed and he is in the possession thereof, and if that fact is not denied by the defendant, then the possession and all the possessory rights of the plaintiff are necessary to be protected. Therefore, application deserves to be allowed. In the circumstances, following order is passed.

**ORDER**

(1)	Ad interim temporary injunction is granted in favour of the plaintiff / applicant. The respondent is hereby restrained from causing any sort of interference or obstruction personally or through anybody, into the use and enjoyment of the suit property by the applicant / plaintiff, till further order.
(2)	The defendant is directed to file his say to application Exh.05 on next date.
(3)	Both the sides are directed to argue application Exh.05 as soon as the say to said application is filed by the defendant.

Date:13.03.2026  
Place: Lonar.

Sd/-  
(R. B. Hanwate)  
Civil Judge, Jr. Division, Lonar.