

**MHRG17004
7552019**



Presented on : 01.12.2014
Registered on : 01.12.2014
Decided on : 12.03.2026
Duration : Y M D
11 03 11

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT JUDGE - 2, PANVEL,
DIST. RAIGAD

(Presided over by Dinesh E. Kothalikar)
(B. Com, L.L.M.)

Regular Civil Appeal No.271/2019
(Old Regular Civil Appeal No.185/2014)
CNR NO. MHRG170047552019
Exhibit No.33/A

1. **Shri. Gurudev Singh Jogindersingh Kohali**
Age-48 years, Occu.-Business,
R/at- In front of Rupali Talkies,
Tal-Panvel, Dist-Raigad.Appellant.

Versus

1. **Dr. Mangalsingh Dagadusingh Rajput**
Age-64 years, Occu.-Doctor,

2. **Dr. Ranjana Mangalsingh Rajput**
Age-60 years, Occu.- Doctor,
R/at- Pritam Hospital, Final Plot
No.216/a/A, Mahatma Gandhi
Road, Tal-Panvel, Dist-Raigad.

3. **Shri. Surjitsingh Santsingh Kohali**
Age-65 years, Occu.- Business,

R/at- Palaspe Phata, Mumbai-Pune
Road, Behind I.B.P Petrol Pump,
Tal-Panvel, Dist-Raigad.

Since deceased through LR's

3/1. Guravindarkaur Surjitsingh Kohali

Age-65 years, Occu.- Household,

3/2. Priteshkaur Surjitsingh Kohali

Age-42 years, Occu.- Household,

3/3. Parmitkaur Surjitsingh Kohali

Age-39 years, Occu.- Household,

3/4. Paldipkaur Surjitsingh Kohali

Age-36 years, Occu.- Household,

3/5. Harnitkaur Surjitsingh Kohali

Age-34 years, Occu.- Household,

3/6. Abhijitsingh Surjitsingh Kohali

Age-30 years, Occu.- Business,
Nos.3/1 to 3/6 R/at- Palaspe Phata,
Mumbai-Pune Road, Behind I.B.P
Petrol Pump, Tal-Panvel, Dist-Raigad.

....Respondents

**Appeal against the impugned Judgment and
Decree passed by learned Civil Judge Junior
Division, Panvel in Regular Civil Suit
No.13/1998 dated 31/01/2012.**

Appearance:-

Learned Advocate Mr. D. N. Joshi for the appellant.

Learned Advocate Mr. Amit Chavan for the respondents.

Dinesh E. Kothalikar,
District Judge-2 and ASJ,
Panvel-Raigad.

:: J U D G M E N T ::

(Delivered on this 12th day of March, 2026)

1. Being aggrieved by the judgment and order passed by learned Civil Judge Junior Division, Panvel in Regular Civil Suit No.13/1998, the appellant, original defendant No.2 has approached this Court under the appellate jurisdiction.

(For the sake of convenience parties are hereinafter referred as per their status before the Trial Court).
2. The facts relevant for the determination of the controversy at hand, can be stated as under;
3. That the property bearing Final Plot No.216/1 more particularly described in para (1) i.e. shopping block Nos.3 and 4 situated at ground floor is the subject matter of the present suit. The plaintiffs claimed that the suit property was originally owned by Mr. Valiram Asandas Jeswani and the same was let out to defendant No.1 by the original landlord on 07/07/1977 by rent agreement for personal use. Defendant No.1 used to run business in the name and style of New Maharashtra Motor Stores and selling spare parts of vehicle.
4. Thereafter, the plaintiffs have purchased said property on 01/10/1986 by registered sale deed and acquired ownership of the suit premises. The building is double

Dinesh E. Kothalikar,
District Judge-2 and ASJ,
Panvel-Raigad.

storied and out of it the shopping blocks bearing No.3 and 4 were let out to defendant No.1 on rent. Defendant No.1 used to run the business in the suit property. Thereafter, he had changed name of the shop, i.e. Raigad Automobiles. On inquiry defendant No.1 had informed the plaintiffs that name of the shop has been changed by him.

5. According to the plaintiffs, thereafter they came to know that defendant No.1 sublet said premise to defendant No.2. When the plaintiffs asked defendant No.1, he had given evasive answers. According to the plaintiffs, defendant No.2 does the business in suit premises and defendant No.1 has no concern with the said business.
6. According to the plaintiffs, they issued notice to the defendants, but defendant No.1 did not reply it, and defendant No.2 has replied it falsely. The plaintiffs have claimed that at present, defendant No.1 does his separate business in the name and style of 'The New Maharashtra Motor Stores' in another building namely Subhash Apartment.
7. According to the plaintiffs, the suit property was given on rental basis to defendant No.1 personally, but he has sublet the premises to defendant No.2 and committed breach of the condition of the rent agreement. Thus, the plaintiffs have claimed that they are entitled for recovery of possession of the suit property.

8. Hence, the plaintiffs have filed the suit and prayed for possession of the suit property.
9. It appears from the written statement of defendant No.1 Exh.48 that he has admitted contents of paragraph No.1 of the plaint. He has also admitted that at present, name of the shop is changed to Raigad Motor Stores. He admits that he had taken the suit property on rent by an agreement dated 07/07/1977 from original owner Mr. Jeswani. He has also admitted that monthly rent of one shopping block was Rs.230/- and up to the year 1980, he was doing business under the name and style of 'New Maharashtra Motor Stores' and in the year 1982, defendant No.2 become partner and after addition of partner of defendant No.2, they had taken shop and shopping license and in the year 1987, he has handed over two shopping blocks to defendant No.2 by accepting amount of Rs.30,000/-.
10. According to defendant No.1, Third shopping block was in his possession up to the year 1990 and that he had handed over possession of the 3rd shopping block to defendant No.2, however, since the year 1990, he has no concern with the suit property and defendant No.2 does business in the suit premises since the year 1987 independently.
11. According to defendant No.1, he has handed over possession of the suit property to defendant No.2 and

since the year 1990, he has no concern with the suit property. Thus, it prayed that the suit may be dismissed, against him, with costs.

12. Defendant No.2 has contested the suit by filing written statement Exh.15. According to him, he was tenant in the suit property prior to the purchase of the suit premises by the plaintiffs. He has further contended that defendant No.1 is his real paternal uncle and he is the younger brother of his father Jogindarsingh, due to it, rent receipt was issued in the name of defendant No.1, but in the year 1980-81, name of the shop was changed to Raigad Automobiles and thereafter, there was family dispute between defendant No.1 and his father. At present, his relations with defendant No.1 are not cordial.
13. Defendant No.2 claims that the suit property is in his possession since the year 1980-81 and he pays rent regularly to Mr. Jeswani. The shop has also recorded in his name in the record of Municipal Council. Defendant No.2 has specifically claimed that, he is not subtenant of the suit property but he is the tenant. According to him, even though receipts are in the name of defendant No.1, actually it was let out to their family and at present, there are disputes between defendants No.1 and 2 and by taking disadvantage of the same, the plaintiffs have filed this

false suit. Hence, he has prayed for dismissal of the suit.

14. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties the learned Civil Judge was pleased to frame issues vide Exh.21. After the parties have adduced their respective evidence, the learned Civil Judge was pleased to decree the suit.
15. The aforesaid judgment and decree has been questioned in this appeal. I have heard the submissions made by learned advocate Mr. D. N. Joshi for the appellant and learned advocate Mr. Amit Chavan for respondents. The learned advocate for defendant No.2 has also placed on record written notes of arguments at Exh.30.
16. After hearing, submissions of both the sides, following points arise for my consideration and I have recorded my findings against them, with the reasons as under;

Sr. No.	Points	Findings
1.	Whether defendant No.1 sublet the suit premises to defendant No.2 as alleged ?	... In the affirmative.
2.	Whether plaintiffs are entitled for recovery of possession of the suit premises ?	... In the affirmative.
3.	Whether the order passed by the learned Civil Judge required interference?	... In the negative.
4.	What order?	As per final

Dinesh E. Kothalikar,
District Judge-2 and ASJ,
Panvel-Raigad.

		order.
--	--	--------

::REASONS::

17. The plaintiff has examined Mangalsingh Dagadusingh Rajput as PW-1 at Exh.59 and Gangaram Urankar as PW-2 at Exh.68.
18. The plaintiff has relied upon documentary evidence viz. Extract of Property Card of Final Plot No.216/1/A at Exh.61, copy of Sale-Deed dated 02/12/1986 at Exh.62, Rent Agreement dated 07/07/1977 at Exh.63, Reply given by defendant No.2 to the notice dated 20/03/1995 at Exh.64, Rent Agreement in Final Plot No.216/1A at Exh.69, Letter dated 02/12/1986 at Exh.70, rent receipts at Exh.78, 79, 80, 83 to 94.
19. Defendant has examined Surjitsingh Santsigh Kohali as DW-1 at Exh.101 and Gurudevsiingh Jogindersingh Kohali as DW-2 at Exh.107.
20. The defendant has placed on record copy of register notice dated 28/03/1997 at Exh.119, copy of registration certificate at Exh.120, No objection issued by MTNL, Mumbai at Exh.121.
21. Upon perusal of the written submissions made by

Dinesh E. Kothalikar,
District Judge-2 and ASJ,
Panvel-Raigad.

defendant No.2, it is found that an attempt was made to raise an objection on the point of framing of issues. According to him, the learned Civil Judge has framed issues based on the pleadings of the plaintiffs only and that no issues in respect of the case set out by defendant No.2 has been framed. Therefore, it is claimed to remand the matter for framing proper issues. Framing of issues in civil litigation involves identifying, isolating, and refining shared questions of fact or law arising from pleadings to narrow the controversy. Under Order XIV of the CPC, courts must ensure issues are specific, accurate, and distinct, often consolidating overlapping points to avoid confusion and redundant evidence.

22. In this regard, it is undisputed that the plaintiffs have come with the case that the suit premises has been sublet by defendant No.1 to defendant No.2. As against this, defendant No.2 has come with the case that the suit property was let out to defendant No.1 for running the family business. In these circumstances, while deciding the issue in respect of subletting the suit premises by defendant No.1 to defendant No.2, the court is simultaneously required to deal with the contention of defendant No.2 and to find out whether the suit property was let out for the family business of defendant No.1.

Thus, since the learned Civil Judge had framed the issue in respect of subletting of the suit premises by defendant No.1 to defendant No.2, it also covers the contention of defendant No.2. In my view if the learned Civil Judge had framed the issue as asserted by defendant No.2, in that case such an issue would have been overlapping issue and it would have caused repetition, while deciding both the issues separately. Therefore, I do not find merit in the submissions advanced on behalf of defendant No.1 and thus, it is concluded that no case is made out to remand the matter by framing additional issues.

23. Learned advocate for the plaintiffs has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Celina Coelho Pereira Vs Ulhas Mahabaleshwar Kholkar (2010) 1 SCC 217** and submitted that no doubt the initial burden to prove the subtenancy is on the plaintiffs, but once it is established that the third party is in possession of the suit premises, in that case burden shifts upon the possessor to prove the nature of possession. In the said case the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that;

“The legal position that emerges from the aforesaid decisions can be summarised thus:

- (i) In order to prove mischief of subletting as a ground for eviction under rent control laws, two ingredients have to be established, (one) parting

with possession of tenancy or part of it by tenant in favour of a third party with exclusive right of possession and (two) that such parting with possession has been done without the consent of the landlord and in lieu of compensation or rent.

(ii) Inducting a partner or partners in the business or profession by a tenant by itself does not amount to subletting. However, if the purpose of such partnership is ostensible and a deed of partnership is drawn to conceal the real transaction of sub-letting, the court may tear the veil of partnership to find out the real nature of transaction entered into by the tenant.

(iii) The existence of deed of partnership between tenant and alleged sub-tenant or ostensible transaction in any other form would not preclude the landlord from bringing on record material and circumstances, by adducing evidence or by means of cross-examination, making out a case of sub-letting or parting with possession in tenancy premises by the tenant in favour of a third person.

(iv) If tenant is actively associated with the partnership business and retains the control over the tenancy premises with him, may be along with partners, the tenant may not be said to have parted with possession.

(v) Initial burden of proving subletting is on landlord but once he is able to establish that a third party is in exclusive possession of the premises and that tenant has no legal possession of the tenanted premises, the onus shifts to tenant to prove the nature of occupation of such

third party and that he (tenant) continues to hold legal possession in tenancy premises.

(vi) In other words, initial burden lying on landlord would stand discharged by adducing prima facie proof of the fact that a party other than tenant was in exclusive possession of the premises. A presumption of sub-letting may then be raised and would amount to proof unless rebutted”

24. As against this, learned advocate for defendant No.2 Mr. Joshi has submitted that the plaintiffs are required to prove the subletting by adducing evidence in respect of consideration like rent and premium. In support of the submissions reliance has been placed upon the judgment in the case of **Dattatraya Kaluram Jadhav Vs Narayandas Badridas Rathi Laws (Bom) 1973 7 29.**
25. He would further submit that mere occupation is not sufficient to infer subtenancy and any amount of evidence without adequate pleading cannot be read in evidence. To substantiate the contention, reliance has been placed upon the judgment in the case of **CC YI (Dr), Medical Practitioner, Bhiwandi Vs Smt. Janakidevi Anantlal Gupta 2001 (4) Mh.L.J. 114.**
26. Further, it has been submitted that where a family member starts staying with original tenant, it is not a sub tenancy. In this regard, reliance has been placed upon the

judgment of Hon'ble Bombay High Court in the case of **Vasant Mahadev Pandit Vs Zaibunnisa Abdul Sattar 2001 (3) Mh.L.J. 118.**

27. To start with, the ground of unlawful subletting of the Suit premises on which the decree of eviction was passed in RCS No.13 of 1998. It was the specific case of the Plaintiffs that, defendant No.1 was running the business of selling spare parts of the Motors under the name and style of "New Maharashtra Motor Stores" in the Suit premises. He was having complete control over the demised premises. Subsequently, defendant No.1 had closed the business in the suit premises and defendant No.2 started a business under the name and style of "Raigad Automobiles".
28. An endeavour was made on behalf of Defendant No.2 to demonstrate that there was no subletting of the Suit premises as he possessed the suit premises, before the plaintiffs have purchased the suit premises. Mr. Joshi, the learned advocate for defendant No.2 would urge that the learned Civil Judge was not at all justified in discarding the receipts which were issued by the plaintiffs in favour of defendant No.2, when he had issued rent to the plaintiffs.
29. Mr. Amit Chavan, the learned Counsel for the Plaintiffs

Dinesh E. Kothalikar,
District Judge-2 and ASJ,
Panvel-Raigad.

would, however, submit that the rent receipts were issued by the plaintiffs in favour of defendant No.1 only and therefore, the mere fact that the rent receipts were produced by defendant No.2 would not be sufficient to term him as tenant. It has been submitted that the Plaintiffs have led positive evidence showing that the premises was unlawfully sublet. In contrast, the Defendants have failed to discharge the onus by explaining the circumstances in which defendant No.2 is in the occupation of the Suit premises.

30. It is well recognized that where a third person is found in the possession of the demised premises, the onus rests on the tenant and, such third person, is required to explain the capacity in which he is in the occupation of the demised premises. True, a tenant may enter into a partnership and retain the control over the demised premises and, in such a situation, the tenancy rights cannot be said to have been transferred. In such a case the Court is required to examine the real nature of the transaction between the tenant and the stranger occupant.
31. Plaintiff has filed his affidavit in lieu of examination in chief at Exh.59, wherein he has reiterated the contents of the plaint. Defendant No.1 admitted said fact. In the evidence of the plaintiff rent agreement Exh.63 has been

brought on record. Upon perusal of the agreement Exh.63 it is revealed that it has taken place between Mr. Valiram Jeswani and defendant No.1 Surjitsingh and that defendant No.1 had given four cheques for Rs.2,500/- each i.e. total amount of Rs.10,000/- on 17th April, 1976 and that he had agreed to pay amount of Rs.20,000/-. Upon perusal of the agreement Exh.63 it is found that said agreement was executed by defendant No.1. In the cross-examination of defendant No.2 it has been brought on record that he knew about the rent agreement between defendant No.1 and previous landlord and that the same rent agreement has been continued between the plaintiffs and defendant No.1 and that defendant No.1 has been accepted as a tenant by the plaintiffs.

32. According to defendant No.2, said agreement was executed by defendant No.1 on behalf of his family and defendant No.1 is his paternal uncle and that since beginning, he was working with defendant No.1 and that at present independently he does the business in the said premises. Thus, it is claimed that since said tenancy was executed for their family, it can not be said that defendant No.1 sublet the said property to defendant No.2.
33. In this matter, defendant No.1 filed his separate written statement and contended that on 07/07/1977 as per lease

agreement, he had taken suit property in his possession from Mr. Jeswani and that up to the year 1980, he was doing business in the said premise under the name and style “New Maharashtra Motor Stores” and that in the year 1982, he had admitted defendant No.2 as a partner in the said business but, even though registration of the said shop stood in his name and that in the year 1987, he had handed over possession of two shops to defendant No.2 by accepting amount of Rs.30,000/- and in the year 1990, 3rd shop was also handed over to defendant No.2 by accepting amount of Rs.80,000/- and that since the year 1990, he has no concern with the said business.

34. The evidence of defendant No.1 that he had received an amount of Rs.30,000/- in the year 1987 and Rs.80,000/- from defendant No.2, when he had handed over the possession of the suit premises to defendant No.2 has remained unshaken. In the light of this, I am of the view that the judgment in the case of **Dattatraya Kaluram Jadhav (cited supra)** cannot be said to be helpful to defendant No.2. Had it been the case that no evidence in respect of payment by defendant No.2 to defendant No.1 had come on record, in that case the judgment cited, could have been pressed into service.

35. Admittedly, as per tenancy agreement, defendant No.1 was

the only tenant of the said property and that he has admitted that since the year 1990, he has no concern with the said business and that by accepting money from defendant No.2, he has handed over possession of the shops to defendant No.2.

36. It is true that in this matter, suit premises was purchased by the plaintiffs in the year 1986 from the original owner Mr. Jeswani and according to defendant No.1, he has no concern with the said premise since the year 1990.
37. As noted above, the primary onus to explain the presence of the third person in the Suit Premises rests on the tenant or the third person, when he is made a party to the proceeding. In the case at hand, as stated earlier defendant No.1, the original tenant has admitted the case of the plaintiffs that the suit property was originally let out to him and that at present the suit premises is in the possession of defendant No.2. He has further claimed that when the business was started in the suit premises by defendant No.1, at that time his name was registered in the record of Shops and Establishment Act and that later-on he had introduced defendant No.2 as a partner and that in the year 1987 he had handed over 2 shops for the consideration of Rs.30,000/- and that in the year 1990 he had handed over third shop to defendant No.2 for the

consideration of Rs.80,000/- and that since the year 1990 he had no concerned with the suit premises.

38. On the contrary, it appears from the defence of defendant No.2 that he has come with the contention that the contention of the plaintiffs that the suit premises was let out to defendant No.1 in an individual capacity is false. It is his further contention that the business in the suit premises was being run by the family of the defendants and that defendant No.1 being the uncle of defendant No.2, the rent receipt was being issued in his name.
39. In the backdrop of the aforesaid glaring facts, which stare in the face, when defendant No.1 did not support the case set out by defendant No.2, I am of the view heavy burden is cast upon the shoulder of defendant No.2 that the business ran by defendant No.1 was the family business of the defendants and that defendant No.1 was possessing the property for the family business. However, upon perusal of the evidence of defendant No.2, it does not reveal that he has placed on record a single piece of evidence to establish his contention. In this regard, if the cross-examination of defendant No.1 is looked into in that case it would reveal that he has admitted in an unequivocal term that he used to pay rent to the previous landlord and that except him no other person had paid the

amount of rent. He has admitted in clear terms that all the three shops were possessed by him individually and independently and that he did not possess them for the family. His further admission that when he had obtained the shops on rent at that time neither his brothers or defendant No.2 had any concern with it, gives clear dent to the version of defendant No.2.

40. Further, defendant No.2 has failed to bring on record material that his father Jogindersing had started the business in the suit premises. It is to be noted that defendant No.2 in the cross-examination has admitted that defendant No.1 had obtained the suit premises on rent and started his business and that he used to assist defendant No.1, in his business.
41. Had it been the case that defendant No.1 possessed the suit premises for the family business and that defendant No.2 being the family member had continued to possess the suit premises, being the member of joint family, in that case defendant No.2 had no reason to change name of the shop from 'New Maharashtra Motor Stores' to 'Raigad Automobiles'. The very fact that after defendant No.2 started to run the business, he had changed the name of the shop, goes to suggest that there is no force in the contention of defendant No.2 that defendant No.1 used to

run family business in the suit premises. Therefore, the judgment in the case of **Vasant Mahadev Pandit (cited supra)** cannot be said to be helpful to the defence.

42. From this standpoint, failure of defendant No.2 to place on record relevant documents to justify the nature of business, dents the claim of Defendant No.2 that the business of defendant No.1 was a family business.
43. Had it been the case that the business of defendant No.1 was a joint family business, in that case defendant No.1 would have shared profits with other family members or defendant No.2 would have shared profit with defendant No.1, from the date when he had started to run business by separating from defendant No.1. On the contrary, the cross-examination of defendant No.1 states that he had no concerned with the income derived by defendant No.2 from the business. There is absolutely no material on record to show that the profits in the business were transferred to the accounts of defendants No.1 and 2 or other family members. This falsifies the version given by defendant No.2 that he possessed the suit premises, being the tenant.
44. Much has been argued by learned advocate for defendant No.2 that since defendant No.2 had produced rent receipts, therefore, it can be said that he is the tenant as

he has paid the amount of rent. It is true that up to the year 1993, rent receipts stood in the name of defendant No.1. It is worthy to be noted that it is specific contention of defendant No.2 that when defendant No.1 was running the business, defendant No.2 has also looked after the business of defendant No.1. There is no evidence adduced by defendant No.2 to contradict the terms of the rent agreement executed by defendant No.1, in his personal capacity with original owner.

45. So far as the registration of the shop of defendant No.1 is concerned, defendant No.2 has admitted in the cross-examination that defendant No.1 used to run business in the name and style of 'New Maharashtra Stores' and that his business was registered in the name of 'New Maharashtra Stores' in his sole name under the Shops and Establishment Act and that defendant No.1 only used to conduct the business. The very admission given by defendant No.2 demolishes his case that the business ran by defendant No.1 was the family business.
46. It is material to note here that defendant No.2 has denied that he was introduced by defendant No.1, as a partner in the said business in the year 1982. In fact, when the cross-examination of defendant No.2 states that in the year 1977 the business was being run by defendant No.1 solely,

in that case it was necessary for defendant No.2 to explain under which capacity he had entered into the suit premises.

47. The cross-examination of defendant No.2 further states that after defendant No.1 had handed over the possession of the suit premises to him, defendant No.1 had started new business at different places and that despite it the plaintiffs have issued rent receipts in favour of defendant No.1.
48. The material brought on record is sufficient to establish that at present, defendant No.1 has no concern with the suit premises and that he has accepted amount from defendant No.2 and handed over possession of the suit premises to him, in such circumstances, there would be no hesitation to conclude that the plaintiffs have succeeded to prove that suit properties have been sublet to defendant No.2 by defendant No.1.
49. Considering the foregoing reasons and attending circumstances, I answer point No.1 in the affirmative.

AS TO POINT No.2:

50. Looking to the entire gamut as well as by taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and in the light of finding recorded against point No.1 that

defendant No.1 had sublet the suit premises to defendant No.2, in my view as per the provision of Section 13(e) of the Act, the plaintiffs are entitled to recover possession of the suit premises. As a sequitur to the above discussion I answered point No.2 in the affirmative.

AS TO POINT NO.3 -

51. Reverting to the facts and circumstances of the case, I have gone through the judgment delivered by the learned Civil Judge. In the light of the settled position in law stated supra, the inference regarding the subletting drawn by the learned Civil Judge cannot be said to be unjustifiable. Therefore, viewed from any angle, the findings recorded by the learned Civil judge are in consonance with the evidence brought on record. There is no perversity in the findings. Thus, I hold that no interference is called for in appellate jurisdiction. Consequently, I answered point No.3 in the negative.

As to Point No.4 :-

52. Upon cumulative consideration of all the aforesaid circumstances as well as law on the subject and the findings recorded against points No.1 to 3 stated supra, I hold that the appeal deserves to be dismissed with costs. Consequently, I proceed to pass following order;

Dinesh E. Kothalikar,
District Judge-2 and ASJ,
Panvel-Raigad.

ORDER

1. The appeal is hereby dismissed with costs.
2. The decree and judgment passed by the learned Civil Judge Junior Division, Panvel Dist. Raigad in R.C.S. No.13 of 1998 is hereby confirmed.
3. The record and proceeding of R.C.S. No.13/2098 along with copy of the judgment be sent to the learned Civil Judge, Panvel.
4. Decree be drawn accordingly.
(Dictated and pronounced in open Court.)

Panvel.**Date : 12th March, 2026.****(Dinesh E. Kothalikar)****District Judge-2, Panvel,
Dist-Raigad.**

Dinesh E. Kothalikar,
District Judge-2 and ASJ,
Panvel-Raigad.