

MHKO120000352021



Reg.Civil Suit No.12/2021

(CNR No.MHKO120000352021)

Order below Exh.77

Perused the application and say. Heard both sides.

02. The defendants have filed this application to direct the plaintiff to correct the valuation in consonance with the valuation certificate filed below list Exh. 66/2 and 66/1. I consider submissions of both sides. The record shows that the plaintiff has directed to correct valuation as per order passed below Exh. 63. Accordingly, the amendment application of plaintiff below Exh. 72 is allowed on merits. The plaintiff has paid the court fee of Rs. 6,830/- and make the valuation in respect of her share in Gat No. 1275 as Rs. 1,19,700/-. The said valuation is confined to her share. It is supported with the valuation certificate issued by Sub Registrar, Bhudargad at list Exh. 75/1.

03. On the contrary the valuation report filed by defendant below Exh. 66/2 is in respect of the entire area. Therefore, the difference found in both valuation certificate. But the directions issued in order below Exh. 63 are confined to the share of plaintiff which is properly made. Hence, there is no need to make the valuation of the entire area and to take the assistance of valuation certificate filed below list Exh. 66/2. Hence, I do not found any merits in this application. Resultantly, I pass following order.

ORDER

1)	The application (Exh.77) is hereby rejected.
2)	Both parties and Advocates to take note of order.

Date : 04/02/2025

(V. V. Kulkarni)
Civil Judge Junior Division,
Gargoti