



ORDER PASSED BELOW EXH.1 IN
Cri. M.A. NO. 92/2022.
(CNR No.MHPU170021522022).
Sumaiyya Nihal Shaikh Vs. Nihal Kamaruddin
Shaikh & Ors.

1. This is an application for setting aside no say order passed against respondent Nos. 1 to 5.
2. This application is preferred by all respondents contending that, respondents are willing to file their say. However, they could not file their say within time due to lack of knowledge. Therefore, they prayed for allowing an application.
3. Applicant has filed her say, contending that, application is not lawful. It is false. No justifiable reason is mentioned in an application. Therefore, she prayed for rejection of an application.
4. Perused application, say. Heard.
5. On perusal of record, it appears that, notices are served on respondents on 22/11/2022. Respondents have filed their Vakalatnama on their behalf on 21/02/2023. Present application is filed on 14/03/2023. On 02/02/2023, this Court was pleased to pass no say order against respondents. Considering these facts and circumstances, it is just and proper to allow respondents to file their say, subject to payment of cost to applicant. Hence, I proceed to pass following order-

ORDER

1. Application is allowed as under.
2. The no say order dated 02/02/2023, is hereby set aside, subject to payment of cost of Rs.500/-, payable to applicant.
3. On payment of cost to applicant, respondents are permitted to file their say.
4. Parties to take note.

Indapur.

(P.L.Patil)

Date : 01-07-2023.

Judicial Magistrate First Class, Indapur.

CERTIFICATE

“I affirm that the contents of this P.D.F. judgment/order file are same word for word as per it's original judgment/order.”

Name of the Steno : R.S.Parve,
Stenographer, L.G.-III.

Name & Designation of the : P.L.Patil,
Court Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Indapur.

Date of order : 01/07/2023.

Date of order signed by
Presiding Officer : 01/07/2023.

Date of Upload : 04/07/2023.