



ORDER PASSED BELOW EXH.19
IN REGULAR CIVIL SUIT NO.64/2026

[CNR No.MHKO090001602026]

Read application. Heard the Ld. Advocate for the plaintiff at length. It is the contention of the Ld. Advocate for the plaintiff that the defendants issued notice to the plaintiff for removal of tin-shed constructed over the suit property. The defendants though appeared in the suit, but not filed their say to the interim injunction application. Therefore, if meanwhile the status of the property is changed, then it will amount to multiplicity of the proceeding and also the object of filing of the interim application will be frustrated.

2. I have given thoughtful consideration to the argument advanced. Admittedly, the defendants though served with the summons, but not filed their say to the application. Whether the construction of tin-shed by the plaintiff is on encroached portion or not, it is the matter of merit and can be comment upon while deciding the interim injunction application. However, if till then the status of the property is not protected, then the object of filing the interim injunction application will be totally frustrated and it will also amounts to further complex issues. Thus, I am of the view that it is just and necessary to protect the status of the

property. Hence, I pass the following order :-

ORDER

- 1] The defendant nos.1 to 4 are directed to maintain status-quo regarding the suit property till next date.
- 2] Plaintiff is directed to file affidavit that tin-shed is still standing over the suit property.
- 3] Cost in cause.

Place : Gadhinglaj.
Date : 02.04.2026.

(N. S. Puri)
Civil Judge Senior Division,
Gadhinglaj