

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL SIDE JURISDICTION
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.214 OF 2014
IN
EXECUTION APPLICATION NO.129 OF 2014
ALONGWITH
EXECUTION APPLICATION (L) NO.370 OF 2014
AND
COURT RECEIVERS REPORT NO.246 OF 2011
IN
SUIT NO.2471 OF 1984

Jitendra Nanalal Trivedi ... Applicant /
Plaintiff

Vs.

Ramesh Nanalal Shah & Ors. ... Defendants

Mr. Zal Andhyarujina, Adv. a/w. Haresh Meghani, Adv. a/w. Ms.
Vrushali S., Adv. i/b. Vinod Thaker, Adv. for plaintiff.

Drupad Patil, Adv. for the respondents No.1.

Pavan S Patil, Adv. for the respondent No.10.

CORAM : MRS. ROSHAN DALVI, J.

DATE : 14th August, 2015.

P.C. :

1. The parties have negotiated some settlements. The parties agree in principal that a compound wall would be required to protect the suit property which is open land. However, the plaintiff contends that the cost of the compound wall suggested by the respondents in the Notice of Motion is prohibitive at Rs.50 lacs. The plaintiff shall be entitled to bring a quotation of any other contractor. The respondents agree that if the compound wall can be constructed at lesser cost they would agree to such quotation. All other parties to the Chamber Summons have been served and have not protested against the construction of the compound wall.

2. Notice of Motion is disposed of accordingly.

(ROSHAN DALVI, J.)