

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

SECOND APPEAL NO. 338 OF 2017

Pundlik s/o Insaram Rajgire and another

-vs-

Suresh s/o Dudiram Rajgire and others

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

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Mr. O.W.Gupta, counsel for the appellants.
Mr. A.R.Kaple, counsel h/f Mr. A.M.Quazi, counsel for the respondent
Nos.1 to 4.

CORAM : V. M. DESHPANDE, J.

DATE : 31.10.2017.

CIVIL APPLN. (S) NO.1146 OF 2017

This is an application for permission to delete the name of respondent No.9-Jagatram Tanba Rajgire from the array of the respondents.

Heard Shri O.W.Gupta, the learned counsel for the appellants and Shri A.R.Kaple, the learned counsel holding for Shri A.M. Quazi, the learned counsel for the respondent Nos.1 to 4.

Since the appellants want to delete the name of the respondent No.9 in the memo of second appeal, the permission is granted to the appellants to delete the name of respondent No.9-Jagatram Tanba Rajgire at their risk. Application is allowed and disposed of.

CIVIL APPLN. (S) NO.1147 OF 2017

This is an application for permission to delete the name of respondent No.12-Madhukar Tanba Rajgire from the array of the respondents.

Heard Shri O.W.Gupta, the learned counsel for the appellants and Shri A.R.Kaple, the learned counsel holding for Shri A.M. Quazi, the learned counsel for the respondent Nos.1 to 4.

Since the appellants want to delete the name of the respondent No.12 in the memo of second appeal, the permission is granted to the appellants to delete the name of respondent No.12-Madhukar Tanba Rajgire at their risk. Application is allowed and disposed of.

SECOND APPEAL NO.338 OF 2017

Office has raised objection that the appellants have not filed civil application for correct address of the respondent No.4. Shri Kaple, the learned counsel holding for Shri A.M.Quazi, the learned counsel for the respondent Nos.1 to 4, submitted that they have already filed their Vakalatnama for and on behalf of respondent No.4-Ramesh Dudiram Rajgire. Thus, the said respondent is served. Accordingly the office objection raised in that behalf is overruled.

CIVIL APPLN. (S) NO. 577 OF 2017

This is an application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 or under Order XLI Rule 5 of Civil Procedure Code for

temporary injunction during the pendency of the present appeal.

Shri Kaple, the learned counsel for the respondent Nos.1 to 4, prays for two weeks time to file reply to this application.

Put up this matter after four weeks for consideration of Civil Application (S) No.577 of 2017. Needless to say, in the meanwhile, reply be filed.

JUDGE