

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

**FIRST APPEAL NO. 161 OF 1999**

Bansi Sadashiv Patil

.. Appellant

VERSUS

Huma Dongar Talele and others

.. Respondents

**WITH**

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 10944 OF 2005 IN F.A. 161 OF 1999  
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 5544 OF 2000 IN F.A. 161 OF 1999  
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 5545 OF 2000 IN F.A. 161 OF 1999  
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 10943 OF 2005 IN F.A. 161 OF 1999  
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 10946 OF 2005 IN F.A. 161 OF 1999  
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 10945 OF 2005 IN F.A. 161 OF 1999  
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 10940 OF 2005 IN F.A. 161 OF 1999  
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 10939 OF 2005 IN F.A. 161 OF 1999

----

Mr. T.S. Lodhe, Advocate i/b. Mr. V.T. Choudhari, Advocate  
for the appellant/applicant

Mr. P.R. Katneshwarkar, Advocate for respondent nos.1 to 7

----

**CORAM : M.T. JOSHI, J.**

**DATE : 28/01/2015**

**ORAL ORDER :**

1. Heard both sides.
2. Mr. Katneshwarkar points out that this being the dispute arising out of the order passed under the Bombay Public Trust Act, the legal representatives of the deceased are not required to be brought on record and the matters can be heard finally.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the appellant submits that the legal representatives are necessary in view of the claim of the present appellant/applicant.

4. Considering the submissions, the applications for bringing the legal representatives on record are hereby allowed by condoning the delay in filing the said applications.

5. The legal representatives be brought on record within a period of two weeks from the date of this order.

6. No need to issue fresh notice of respondent no.6, as Mr. Katneshwarkar already appears for respondent nos.1 to 7.

7. All the present Civil Applications are accordingly allowed and disposed of.

8. Place the appeal for final hearing on 23/02/2015.

**[M.T. JOSHI]**  
**JUDGE**

arp/