

**Order below Exh.8 in RCS No.273/2025**  
**(Aparna Kulkarni & Anr/ Balkrushna Kulkarni)**  
(CNR NO.MHSN02-001967-2025)

This is an application for maintaining status-quo so as to restrain the defendant from causing obstruction to the plaintiff's possession over suit property 1-B i.e. Gat No.49 situated at village Tung and restraining defendant from alienation of Gat No.48. Ld. Advocate for plaintiff Mr. S. S. Patil has pressed for ad-interim status-quo before issuance of notice to defendant till disposal of application for temporary injunction at Exh.5.

2. He has relied on the two consolidation extracts i.e. 9-A and 9-B extracts at Exh.11/1 and 11/2, which apparently shows that after the consolidation scheme, survey No.7-A has been renumbered as Gat No.49 and survey No.7-B has been renumbered as Gat No.48. He tried to correspond the said consolidation extracts with the statement of defendant No.1-B in Measurement Register No.4140/2020 stating to stay the measurement proceedings due to the substantial difference in land records and those gat numbers which is at Exh.3/13, as well as the explanation made by Deputy Superintendent of Land Records to the plaintiff about the difference in Gat Nakasha, consolidation extracts and other land records at Exh.3/16.

3. Perused the record. Heard Ld. Advocate for plaintiff.

4. The consolidation extracts at Exh.11/1 and 11/2 have been

produced after the order below Exh.5 which directed to issue show cause notice to defendant without granting ad-interim injunction in favour of plaintiffs. Those certified copies of consolidation extracts are dated 05.07.2024. They show that the old survey No.7-A has been renumbered as Gat No.49 and old survey No.7-B has been renumbered as Gat No.48. However the area of concerned property corresponds with the 7/12 extracts at Exh.3/5 and 3/7. Therefore without going into the merits of the case, it can be said that there is no discovery of a fresh document/evidence after the order below Exh.5 dated 29.09.2025 which will compel this court to recall/review its own order below Exh.5 and thereby directing imposition of status-quo against defendant which will have the effect same as ad-interim injunction. In such case if there is any apparent error in the said order then it cannot be rectified by a subsequent application in the same proceeding. Therefore, in my opinion, the principles of natural justice demands hearing other side if there is no change in circumstances after passing the earlier order below Exh.5 and before service of notice to other party. Hence, before passing any other order below this application, I pass following order-

**ORDER**

1. Issue show cause notice to defendant for disposal of this application according to law.
2. S. B. is allowed as per rules.

**Sangli**  
**Date:-09.10.2025**

**(Onkar S. Shastri)**  
**5<sup>th</sup> Jt. Civil Judge Jr. Dn., Sangli**