

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**BENCH AT AURANGABAD****WRIT PETITION NO. 9159 OF 2017**

Shri. Sachin Tanaji Vishwekar

... **Petitioner****Vs.**

Shilabai W/o Manikrao Kemdharane and Ors.

... **Respondents**

Mr. P.R. Katneshwarkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Y.R. Mahajan & Datta A. Madake, Advocate for Respondent No.1

Mr. A.A. Khande, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 4A to 10.

with

WRIT PETITION NO. 9185 OF 2017

Bhagwat Sahebrao Chede and Ors.

... **Petitioners****Vs.**

Smt. Shilabai W/o Manikrao Kemdharne

... **Respondent**

Mr. Mayur Salunke h/f. V.D. Salunke, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. Y.R. Mahajan & Datta A. Madake, Advocate for Respondent.

CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL, J.**DATE : 28.09.2018****ORDER :**

After the judgment was pronounced the learned advocates for the petitioners in both the writ petitions submit that by an oral statement made on behalf of the respondent no.1 / plaintiff / decree holder, the execution was not proceeded with and the same arrangement may be continued for three weeks to enable the petitioners to approach the Supreme Court.

2. The learned advocate for the respondent no.1 / plaintiff / decree holder opposes the request.

3. Having considered the fact that since inception the learned advocate for the respondent no.1 / plaintiff / decree holder had made a statement that the execution would not be proceeded with and which arrangement continued till this date, in my considered view, the interest of justice demands that the same arrangement continues for three weeks, to enable the petitioners to approach the Supreme Court. The arrangement shall therefore continue for three weeks.

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)