

**MHLA15000993-2017****ORDER BELOW EXH.123.**

1. This application is filed by plaintiff for maintain status quo in respect of suit property. Defendants no.1,15 and 18 filed their say on said application opposed it.
2. It is submitted by plaintiff that, plaintiff has filed suit for partition against defendants. During pendency of this suit, defendant no.2 and 15 sold suit property bearing gat no. 100/7 and 100/10. Other defendants are likely to transfer the suit property. Therefore, this application is filed for status quo against all defendants.
3. Defendant no.1,15 and 18 filed their say and submitted that, other defendants are not appeared and the summons or notices are not served against other defendants. Heard Ld., Adv., Shri. B.B. Nandagawale for the applicant and Shri S.V. Phad for defendant no.1,15 and 18.
4. On perusal of proceeding it appears that there are 31 defendants. In view of pleading of the plaintiff, already on 13.01.1982, 25.07.2002, 22.05.2016, 25.08.2015, 29.05.1990, 05.06.1998, 04.03.1999, 11.03.1994, 30.10.1984, 04.03.2003, 18.12.1980 and some other transactions are took place with respect to suit property.
5. On perusal of proceeding it appears that, written

statement of defendant no. 1,15 and 18 is filed below exh.109. Suit is filed in the year 2017. No application for temporary injunction is filed since institution of suit till filing of the application below exh. 119. There are some defendants against whom notice, summons are not served. Therefore, such defendants are required to be heard. Under such circumstance, ad interim ex-parte injunction cannot be granted. The nature of status quo is not specifically pleaded in the application. Further it cannot be revealed against whom status quo is prayed. Therefore, this application cannot be allowed. Hence, I proceed to pass following order.

**ORDER**

Application (Exh.123) is rejected.

Date : 27.08.2024.

( V.S. Waghmode)  
Civil Judge Junior Division,  
Chakur.