



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

46 ELECTION PETITION NO. 15 OF 2025

DNYANRAJ DHONDIRAM CHOUGULE

VERSUS

PRAVIN VIRBHADRAYYA SWAMI AND OTHERS

....

Mr. S. S. Gangakhedkar, Advocate for the Petitioner

Mr. K. P. Rodge h/f Mr. P. G. Rodge, Advocate for Respondent No.1

....

CORAM : ABHAY S. WAGHWASE, J.

DATE : April 15, 2026

PER COURT :-

1. Today, the matter was listed for hearing on application under Order VII Rule 11.

2. An application is tendered by Mr. S. S. Gangakhedkar, learned counsel for the petitioner, which is taken on record and marked as **EXHIBIT-28**, seeking adjournment on the ground that Writ Petition between the same parties is scheduled before the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court on 16.04.2026. That the present matter has impact over the said Writ Petition and as such, adjournment by way of three weeks is urged for.

3. Respondent No. 1 has filed reply, which is taken on record and marked as **EXHIBIT-29**, strongly objecting to the adjournment. It is contended that, this Court had extensively heard the application under Order VII Rule 11 on 03.11.2025 and since then, although the matter has appeared on several dates, adjournments were sought by the petitioner on the ground of pendency of Writ Petition challenging caste validity, which is being heard by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court.

4. According to the learned counsel, both proceedings, i.e., the Election Petition before this Court and the said Writ Petition, are distinct and have no bearing on each other. The learned counsel lastly submitted that the application for adjournment be rejected with heavy costs and that the Court may proceed with the hearing of application EPAP No. 36 of 2025.

5. Admittedly, the Election Petition is of 2025. During pendency of the Election Petition, an application under Order VII Rule 11 was filed by Respondent No. 1. This Court has heard the learned Senior Counsel, Mr. V. D. Sapkal, and now the arguments of the petitioner are to be heard.

6. It is true that on several dates, adjournments have been sought, however, a parallel Writ Petition between the parties, on the issue of the validity of caste is under consideration before the Hon'ble Division Bench, and on that ground, the matter has been adjourned on previous dates. On the last date, there was no objection to the adjournment on behalf of the present respondent.

7. The matter before the Hon'ble Division Bench is stated to be listed tomorrow, therefore, as a fair opportunity, the application for adjournment is granted for a period of two weeks. However, the learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to ensure that an endeavour is made to conclude the part-heard arguments on the application under Order VII Rule 11.

8. Accordingly, the adjournment is granted for two weeks. Stand over to 29.04.2026.

[ABHAY S. WAGHWASE J.]

SMS