



**IN THE COURT OF HON'BEL CIVIL JUDGE SENIOR
DIVISION AT GANGAKHED**

Civil App. No.04/2026

Rahila Begum

VERSUS

Madhusuand and others

E-31

ORDER
O.S. to Say.

Claim : Injunction.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR,

In the above case plaintiff submits this petition U/o 6 Rule 17 of
C.P.C. for amendment in pleading as under:

CJSD, Gangakhed.

1] That, in paragraph No.6 of plaint plaintiff has avert that, father
of plaintiffs has purchased land survey no.428/5 by way of two
different sale deeds from Sunil Chaudhary and Avinash Chaudhary to
the extent of 01 H 94 R each. It is specifically pleaded that, area
purchased by the sale deed is towards northern side of Parli-
Gangakhed Road.

2] That, in sale deed No. 441/2006 though are purchased by father
of plaintiff was in two portions, area of each part not specifically avert
in sale deed. Second part shown in sale deed is not possession of
father of plaintiff. Father of plaintiff was in possession from southern
side of Gangakhed Parli Road. Defendant no.1 has taken undue
advantage of averments of sale deed and try to encroach on land of


Copy received
Anil Kumar
7.5.26

Received copy
Jyoti
04.7.26

Say.

वादिने वाद्यपत्रासोबत
खेरेदारखत न. 441/2006
या प्रत दाखल केली
आहे त्यामुळे वादिना
खेरेदारखतातील तुकडा न.
2 ची चतुःसीमा भाषित
होती वादिना आमरणदमना
अर्जातील मजकूर वाद्यपत्रातच
वामुद करता आला असता
इतक्याच १५० आर्डर साऱ्या
वापर प्रस्तुत अर्ज भाषित
जिनामू लॉबी देण्यात आला
आहे त्यामुळे अर्ज वापर
करावा
7.5.26 प्रतीवादि 1 ते 3
श्रीकृष्णलक्ष्मी

प्र. ४.४.



plaintiff. Therefore to bring these facts on record, plaintiff want to insert para no. 7 A as under:

“7A] That, in sale deed bearing No.441/2006 dated 16/06/2006 executed by Sunil Ramrao Choudhary in favor of father of defendant no.1 to 3 area purchased shown in two parts. But second part shown by name of father of defendant no.1 to 3 never in possession of their father second part shown in sale deed was not specifically mentioned in area. The area purchased by ~~father of~~ plaintiff no.1 to 3 by way of sale deed was in their possession. This fact could be ascertained as father of plaintiffs has applied to Deputy Inspector of Land Record, Gangakhed in the year 2007 and from measurement it was transpired that area purchased by father of defendant no.1 to 3 was in his possession and entire land was towards southern side of Gangakhed – Parli Road. But defendant no.2 to 3 want to take undue advantage of second part of portion avert in sale deed No.441/2006 to dispossess the plaintiff from peaceful possession. As such suit of plaintiff may kindly be decreed.”

3] That, the proposed amendment does not change the nature of pleading not cause prejudice to other side. Hence to meet ends of

justice proposed amendment may kindly be permitted to carry by inserting para no.7 A in plaint.

PRAYER

It is therefore prayed that, plaintiff may be permitted to amend the plaint by inserting para no. 7 A in plaint mentioned above.

Date : 7/5/26

Plaintiff



**Salma Begum Faizul -Ur-Raheman
Through G.P.A.
Quresh Mohammad Fayyaz S/o
Faizul -Ur-Raheman**

VERIFICATION

It is verified that, contents of above petition are true and correct to the best of our knowledge and belief, hence verified today at Parbhani.


Date : 7/7/26

Plaintiff

Through



**Salma Begum Faizul -Ur-Raheman
Through G.P.A.
Quresh Mohammad Fayyaz S/o
Faizul -Ur-Raheman**



Adv. M. M. Bhogaonkar
parbhani

**IN THE COURT OF HON'BLE CIVIL JUDGE
SENIOR DIVISION AT GANGAKHED**

Civil App. No.04/2026

Rahila Begum
VERSUS
Madhusuand and others

Claim : Injunction.

AFFIDAVIT

I Qureshi Mohammad Fayyaz S/o Faizul –Ur – Raheman, Age :
42 years, Occ.: Business, R/o Parbhani Tq. Dist. Parbhani do hereby
solemnly affirms and state on oath as under:

That, deponent is G.P.A. Holder of plaintiff and on behalf of
plaintiff filed this affidavit.

That, deponent filed petition for amendment in plaint U/o 6
Rule 17 before this Hon'ble court.

That, contents of said petition may kindly be treated as part and
parcel of this affidavit.

That, contents of said petition are true and correct.

Hence this affidavit.

Date : 7/5/26

Deponent


**Qureshi Mohammad Fayyaz S/o
Faizul –Ur-Raheman
R/o Parbhani Tq. Dist. Parbhani**


Superintending
C.J.S.D. Court
Gangakhed

VERIFICATION

It is verified that, contents of above affidavit are true and correct to the best of our knowledge and belief, hence verified today at Parbhani.

Date : 7/5/26

Deponent


Quresh Mohammad Fayyaz S/o
Faizul -Ur-Raheman
R/o Parbhani Tq. Dist. Parbhani

AFFIDAVIT


Solemnly affirmed before me


by Quresh Mohammad Fayyaz
Age 42 yrs own Business R/o Parbhani

Who is identified before me

by Adv Bhogawankar J.M.

To whom I know personally


7/5/26
Adv. Bhogawankar J.M.


Adv. Bhogawankar J.M.



**IN THE COURT OF HON'BLE CIVIL JUDGE SENIOR
DIVISION AT GANGAKHED**

Civil App. No.04/2026

Rahila Begum

VERSUS

Madhusuand and others

Claim : Injunction.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR,

In the above case plaintiff submits as under:

Plaintiff submits the application for extension of status-quo order which is pleased to pass by this Hon'ble court on previous date.

That, Hon'ble court has granted the status-quo for both the sides. On present date plaintiff has filed the application for amendment in plaint which is required for the proper adjudication. Without this amendment controversy between the parties cannot be decided and accordingly multiplicity of litigation as well as complication will be arise. Therefore status-quo order may kindly be extended till the next order on Exh.5

PRAYER

It is therefore prayed that, order of status-quo may kindly be extended till the next order on Exh.5.

Date : 7/5/26

Plaintiff

Through

Adv. M. M. Bhogaonkar
parbhani

Salma Begum Faizul –Ur-Raheman
Through G.P.A.
Quresh Mohammad Fayyaz S/o
Faizul –Ur-Raheman

Say-

ऑवतपुड वपुड ऑवत
साल्यानीत प्रतीवादी
नं. 2 व 3 ला प्रतीवादी
नं. 1 ने हजर केले
पु.वा. नं. 4 हजर न
हजर साक्षा त्याच
तारखेला डायरी दाखल
केल त्यानंतर वादिया
यकीनसाहेबाकडून तारीख
वाढी आज आमदममंद
या अर्ज दिला आहे
वादी ऑवत साल्यानीत
मुद्द्यात तारखा वाढवत आहे
त्यामुळे अर्ज मान्य करवा

ORDER

It is informed that Adv. Daithankar is going to argue on behalf of plaintiffs and Adv. S.A. Deshpande on behalf of defendants going to argue in this matter. Today, both of them are not present before the Court. Both parties has given pursis to keep the matter on 11.05.2026. Hence, status-quo order continued till 11.05.2026.

श्रीकांत कर्ले
7.5.26

पु.वा. नं. 4
7/5/26