

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**APPEAL FROM ORDER NO. 660 OF 2014
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 794 OF 2014
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 895 OF 2014
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 687 OF 2017**

Sudhakar Baburao Lagad and another ... Appellants
Versus
Ms. Pramila Suman Singh Thakur and another ... Respondents

.....

M/s. Sujata A. Mhadgut for the Appellants.
Ms. Pramila Suman Singh Thakur – Respondent No.1- Party-in-
person present.
Ms. Sharon Patole for Respondent No.2.

.....

CORAM : MRS. MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.

DATE : 19th JANUARY, 2018.

P.C.

1. Respondent No.1 is present. She is certified as competent to assist the Court.
2. Learned Counsel for the appellants submits that the respondents have filed a suit for simplicitor injunction against the appellants. Today, Respondent No.1 who was trustee and the

person appointed by her as trustee are no more trustees. As on today, there is no trustee to look after the property of the respondent No.2-trust. She prays that the Charity Commissioner be directed to appoint an officer to look after the trust on his behalf and the suit can continue. She submits that if this arrangement is made, then she is ready to withdraw the appeal.

3. The respondent No.1 – party-in-person submits that the order of removing her from trusteeship and removing the other person appointed by her as trustee has been challenged before the Supreme Court by filing an appeal. She submits that the same will come up for hearing in March-2018.

4. It is confirmed by both the parties that the order of this High Court removing her and the other person from the trusteeship is not stayed either by this High Court itself or by the Supreme Court.

5. In view of these submissions and the facts as on today, there is no trustee to look after the trust and the property of the trust. It is a public trust, hence, the Charity Commissioner is directed to appoint an officer to take care of the trust and the trust property

as an interim arrangement till the decision of the appeal filed by respondent No.1 before the Supreme Court or till the suit is heard finally.

6. With the above observations the Appeal From Order is allowed to be withdrawn and is disposed of accordingly.

7. In view of disposal of Appeal From Order, pending civil applications stand disposed of.

(MRS. MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.)