

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 14322 OF 2018
IN RC 874/2018
IN SECOND APPEAL STAMP NO. 41953 OF 2017

Maniyar Shaikh Maheboob Zahami & Ors. ...Applicants

Versus

Taherabee Abdul Gani Maniyar & Ors. ...Respondents

.....

Mr. B. B. Dahiphale, Advocate holding for Mr. N. P. Patil-Jamalpuarkar, Advocate for Applicants.

Mr. V. S. Valse, Advocate holding for Mr. T. M. Venjane, Advocate for Respondents No. 1 to 3 & 4A to 4E.

.....

CORAM : **SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.**

DATE : **04-02-2019.**

ORAL ORDER :

01. Heard Mr. B. B. Dahiphale, learned Advocate holding for Mr. N. P. Patil-Jamalpuarkar, Advocate for Applicants and Mr. V. S. Valse, Advocate holding for Mr. T. M. Venjane, Advocate for Respondents No. 1 to 3 & 4A to 4E. The second appeal was refused to be registered, as the office has taken objection and they were not removed. Now, the applicant is ready to remove the office objections, which are stated to be of minor nature. However, there is delay of 90 days. The learned Advocate

for the applicant is taking the blame on himself for not paying proper attention when the office objections were raised. For the mistake on the part of Advocate, the client should not suffer and therefore, the delay caused in filing application for restoration is hereby condoned. The said order refusing to register the second appeal for non-compliance of office objection is hereby re-called. Applicant to remove the office objections within two week from today i. e. upto 18.2.2019 and upon the compliance of the same it be listed for consideration on 6.3.2019.

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]

JUDGE

Dahibhate/-