

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

Civil Application (CAW) No. 2560 of 2015

in

Writ Petition No. 87 of 2015

[Dattatraya s/o Vishnu Rane and ors. Vs. State of Maharashtra and ors.]

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
of directions and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's order

Shri D. N. Dani, Advocate for the applicants/original
respondent nos. 15 to 17
Shri A. C. Khare, Advocate for the petitioners
Shri M. V. Samarth, Advocate for respondent no. 19
Shri P. S. Khubalkar, Advocate for respondent nos. 13, 14
and 18
Shri R. P. Masurkar, Advocate for respondent no. 5
Shri S. Zia Qazi, Advocate for respondent no. 12
Mrs. M. H. Deshmukh, AGP for respondent nos. 1, 2 & 4

CORAM : Prasanna B. Varale, J.

DATE : 4-1-2016.

Heard Shri Dani, learned counsel for the
applicants.

It is stated in the application that one
Shri Vishwanath Haware and the legal heirs of one
Shri Jagannath Haware are the legal representatives
of Shri Eknath Haware and these persons are the
beneficiaries of the properties of Shri Eknath Haware.
The submission of learned counsel is that to avoid
any controversy, it would be necessary to add these
persons as the party respondents to the present
petition as he apprehends that they would alienate
the property during the pendency of the present
petition.

Perusal of the order passed by this Court dated
14-1-2015 makes it more than clear that the Court

.....2/-

while issuing notice of final disposal observed in clear and unambiguous terms that any alienation of properties by the respondent nos. 6 to 19 shall be subject to further order of the Court. (*emphasis supplied*) In view of this quote, no ground is made out to pass order in this application. The application thus, being meritless, deserves to be rejected and the same is, accordingly, rejected.

Civil Application (CAW) No. 2562 of 2015

The present application is moved for seeking early hearing of the petition. The petition is filed in the year 2015. There are number of the petitions awaiting their turn which are filed much prior to the present petition. No ground is made out for grant of early hearing or out of turn hearing. Hence, the application stands rejected. However, liberty is granted to move after one year.

JUDGE

wasnik

...../-