

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

C.A.F. No. 3497/2017 IN FIRST APPEAL No. 901/2013

(EXE. ENGINEER, V.I.D.C. -vs- MURALIDHAR LAXMANRAO MEHARE AND OTHERS)

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Shri V.G. Palshikar, counsel for appellant.
Ms. Varsha Wasu, counsel for respondent no.1.
Ms. T.H. Udeshi, AGP for respondent nos.2 to 4.

CORAM: S.B. SHUKRE, J.

DATE : SEPTEMBER 05, 2017.

Heard.

The fact that even after about six months, the respondent no.1 is unable to arrange the solvent surety, indicates that respondent no.1 is unable to get the support of any independent person who act for him as a surety. Therefore, this application can be allowed, but not in terms of prayer clause as no property has been suggested to be offered as a security, but by permitting the applicant/respondent no.1 to furnish his own solvency and standing next surety on the strength of his solvency.

Application is accordingly allowed in terms that respondent no.1 is directed to furnish his own solvency, which shall be equivalent to the amount that the respondent no.1 is permitted to be withdrawn. The

solvent surety be furnished within four weeks from the date of the order.

Application is disposed of.

JUDGE

Yenurkar