

Anju Mahendra Mehta and another Vs. Kaushik Pandya		Petitioners Respondent
--	------------	---------------------------

CORAM : R. G. KETKAR, J.
DATE : DECEMBER 03, 2015

Heard Mr. Parmar, learned Counsel for petitioners and Mr. Jamdar, learned Counsel for respondent at length.

3. Mr. Parmar submitted that the learned trial Judge was not justified in admitting documents at serial No.1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 10. It is not possible to accept this contention. The learned trial Judge while

admitting these documents on record has given reasons. No fault can be found with the reasons. Hence, no case is made out for invocation of powers under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. Petition fails and the same is dismissed. It is, however, expressly made clear that where a decree is appealed from by the petitioner, any error, defect or irregularity in the impugned order, affecting the decision of the case, may be set forth as a ground of objection in the memorandum of appeal as contemplated by Section 105(1) C.P.C.

(R. G. KETKAR, J.)

Minal Parab