

drp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.10784 OF 2014

Pandu Nivrutti Mohite

PETITIONER

VERSUS

Tukaram Shankar Pawar & others

RESPONDENTS

.....

Mr. Amit S. Deshpande, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. P. B. Patil, Advocate for respondents No.1 to 4

.....

[CORAM : SUNIL P. DESHMUKH, J.]

DATE : 20th MARCH, 2015

ORDER :

1. Heard learned advocates for the parties.
2. It appears that effect and operation of the impugned order dated 30th October, 2014 in Miscellaneous Civil Appeal No. 64 of 2014 has been stayed by this Court on 15th December, 2014.
3. After hearing the parties for quite some time, it appears that interest of justice would be sub-served by issuing directions to the trial court for expeditious disposal of the *lis* pending

between the parties.

4. It is stated that in Regular Civil Suit No. 359 of 2010 evidence has already commenced and Regular Civil Suit No. 748 of 2012 is awaiting evidence.

5. Looking at that the properties involved are from the same survey number and both the suits are pending in the courts at Latur and as evidence has already begun in Regular Civil Suit No. 359 of 2010, it would be expedient that Regular Civil Suit No. 748 of 2012 is also heard by the same court which is hearing Regular Civil Suit No. 359 of 2010.

6. As such, Regular Civil Suit No. 748 of 2012 also be heard by the same court, which is hearing Regular Civil Suit No. 359 of 2010. Evidence in the same also be led along with evidence in Regular Civil Suit No. 359 of 2010. Since it is being stated that Regular Civil Suit No. 748 of 2012 has also reached the stage of evidence, both the suits be tried simultaneously and disposed of expeditiously, preferably within a period of six months from today.

7. Interim relief granted by this Court to operate during said period of six months. In case the suits are not disposed of as

stipulated, the interim relief would stand vacated.

8. With aforesaid directions, writ petition stands disposed of.

9. Needless to refer to that it should not be deemed that this Court has made any observations on merits of the matter.

[SUNIL P. DESHMUKH, J.]

drp/B14/wp10784-14