

ATUL

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
CHAMBER SUMMONS NO. 1143 OF 2015
IN
SUIT NO. 710 OF 2015**

Narain Lalchand Sakraney & Another ...Plaintiffs
Versus
Keshavraaj Lalchand Sakraney & 5 Others ...Defendants

Mr. Aditya N. Raut, *i/b Desai Desai Carrimjee & Mulla, for the Plaintiffs.*
Mr. Shailesh Poria, *with Ambareen Mujawar, Mr. Nikhil Rodrigues, i/b Economic Laws Pracice, for Defendants Nos. 1, 2 and 3.*
Mr. Sagar Divekar, *with Ms. Aparna Suresh, for Defendants Nos. 4 and 5.*

CORAM: G.S. PATEL, J
DATED: 21st September 2016

PC:-

1. A statement is made on behalf of the Plaintiffs that complete inspection has been given. I see no reason to dispute this, particularly having regard to paragraph 3 of the Affidavit in Support of this Chamber Summons for inspection filed by Defendants Nos. 1 to 3. That paragraph lists four documents of which these Defendants allegedly sought inspection and the Plaintiffs allegedly refused. The first of these is the 'original' of the Will of Honi L.

Sakraney. It is not in dispute that this is not the Will in respect of which the Suit is filed. It is a Will of the father of Defendant No. 6. It has been mentioned as a historical narrative and no further. The deceased Honi Sakraney was the husband of Plaintiff No. 2.

2. The second document is minutes of a meeting. These have been signed by the Defendant No. 1 amongst others. There is no question of giving inspection of this document. The Defendants Nos. 1 to 3 should have these themselves.

3. The third document is a letter dated 15th November 2012. In this regard, the demanded for inspection is surprising, for this is a letter from the Advocates for Defendants Nos. 1 to 3 themselves to the Advocates for the Plaintiffs. In other words, Defendants Nos. 1 to 3 seek inspection of their own Advocates' letter.

4. As to the originals of other documents on which the Plaintiffs sought leave to rely, inspection has been given. This has been stated by the Plaintiffs by their letter of 16th June 2015. I have seen that letter and I have seen the response of 22nd June 2015, Exhibit "E" at page 33, from the Advocates for Defendants Nos. 1 to 3. The documents mentioned in the letter from the Advocates for Defendants Nos. 1 to 3 are the very ones mentioned in paragraph 3 of the Affidavit in Support, and which I have dealt with above.

5. The Chamber Summons is dismissed with no order as to costs.

(G. S. PATEL, J.)