

Order below Ex. 05 in Regular Civil Suit No. 66 /2026.**(Jaywant Kadam Vs. Kisan Suryawanshi)**

The present application is filed by the plaintiff for granting, Ad-interim injunction/status quo. According to the plaintiff. The defendants are trying to create road on the basis of order passed by the Tahsildar in proceeding No. SR 98/2025 dtd. 12.03.2025 filed under Sec. 5 of the Mamalatdar Courts Act.

02. The present suit is filed for perpetual injunction for restraining defendants from creating road as per order of Tahsildar Dt. 12.03.2025. According to the plaintiff, the Gat no. 176/3 of the plaintiff, has not there in the original application. Further, the panchanama shows that, there is no obstruction on the part of plaintiffs. The Defendant had not applied for road from the Gat no. 176/3. Still, the defendants are trying to create road from Gat no. 176/3. Hence, it is necessary for granting Ad-interim status quo against the defendants. If the application is not allowed, plaintiff will suffer irreparable loss. Hence, prayed for allowing the application.

03. Perused the record. It is contention of the plaintiff that, his Gat no. 176/3 was not subject matter of proceeding before Mamalatdar. Though, admittedly he was party to the proceeding and contested the same. Neither it is contention of the plaintiff that, the Mamaltdar has ordered behind back of the plaintiff nor the said Order of Mamalatdar is illegal. Defendant no. 2 is circle officer, who represents the revenue department. Therefore, whether the proposed act of the defendants is within the scope of the order or not requires consideration from defendants. Considering the situation on record, it

is necessary to hear defendants before passing any order. Hence,
Order.

ORDER

Issue show cause notice to the defendant as to why injunction as
prayed for should not be granted. E.P. And S.B. allowed.

Date : 23.06.2026.

(M.A.Kulkarni)

I/c. Civil Judge, J.D. Kavthe Mahankal.