

ORDER BELOW EXH. 52 IN R.C.S.NO. 353.2024

Jagannath Hindurao Patil and Ors. Vs Chandrakant Kedari alias Babaso Patil and Ors.

Read the plaint, Exh. 52 and affidavit filed in support of the plaint. Perused documents annexed therewith.

02. The present suit is filed for declaration that agreement to sell executed on 08.10.2014 between defendant no. 1 to 5 and defendant no. 8 is not binding on the present plaintiff alongwith consequential relief of possession and permanent injunction. Heard learned advocate for the plaintiffs. He prayed for ex-parte ad-interim injunction against the proposed defendants.

03. It is contended by the plaintiffs that, inspite of knowing the fact of pendency of the present suit in respect of the suit property bearing Gat no. 29 of Kakadwadi, Tal. Miraj, Dist. Sangli, the defendant no. 1, 2, 4, 5/1 and 5/2 sold it to one Nitin Dattatray Chavan and Suvarna Rajaram Mane with the consent of the legal heirs of the defendant no. 6 and the defendant no. 8 vide registered sale deed no. 254/2026 dated 14.01.2026. Therefore, the plaintiff has filed an application under order 1 Rule 10(2) alongwith Order 6 Rule 17 of CPC.

04. Meanwhile, it is contention of the plaintiffs that, they have apprehension that the suit property will be further dealt with by the proposed defendants and it will nothing but create complications in the proceeding. Therefore, the plaintiffs prayed that, the exparte ad-interim injunction be granted against the proposed party.

05. The plaintiffs in support of their contentions filed on record photocopy of registered sale deed executed between the defendant no. 1, 2, 4, 5/1 and 5/2 sold it to one Nitin Dattatray Chavan and Suvarna

Rajaram Mane with the consent of the legal heirs of the defendant no. 6 and the defendant no. 8.

06. Upon the perusal of record it appears that, initially this Court rejected the relief of ad-interim injunction on 10.10.2024 and notices were issued. Thereafter, eventually defendant no. 1 to 5/2 and the defendant no. 8 appeared, however failed to file say within time. Hence, no say order was passed against them on 27.10.2025. The defendants knowing the above orders and pendency of the suit, sold the suit property to one Nitin Chavan and Suvarna Mane without permission of this Court. Therefore, now in order to avoid further complications in respect of suit property, it is fit case to exercise discretion of this Court and grant relief of ex parte ad-interim injunction against the proposed defendant no. 9 and 10. Hence, the order,

ORDER

- i) The ex-parte ad-interim injunction is granted against the proposed defendant no. 9 and 10 till next date.
- ii) The proposed defendant no. 9 and 10 are directed not to alienate the suit property till further orders of this Court.
- iii) The plaintiffs are directed to intimate this order by observing Order 39 Rule 3-A of C.P.C.
- iv) E.P. and S.B. if any is allowed.

Place : Sangli.

Date : 18.03.2026.

(Rohini S. Patil)
Jt. Civil Judge Jr. Dn., Sangli.

ORDER BELOW EXH. 50 IN R.C.S.NO. 353.2024

Jagannath Hindurao Patil and Ors.

Vs.

Chandrakant Kedari alias Babaso Patil and Ors.

Issue notice to proposed defendants and call their say.

Place : Sangli.

Date : 18.03.2026.

(Rohini S. Patil)

Jt. Civil Judge Jr. Dn., Sangli.

-. CERTIFICATE :-

“I affirms that the contents of this P.D.F. Judgment order are same word for word as per original Judgment”.

Name of Steno : S. A. Jamadar (Steno Grade - III)

Name of the court : Jt. C.J.J.D., Sangli.

Date : 18.03.2026

Order signed by presiding officer on : 18.03.2026

Order uploaded on : 18.03.2026