

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION NO.180 OF 2019

(Jivanbi @ Jiganbi Mahamad Sayyad Vs. Dr. Sou. Sunita Sachin Patil and another)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, appearances, Court's orders, or directions, and Registrar's Orders	Court's or Judge's orders
--	----------------------------------

Mr. Bhooshan R. Mandlik for Applicant.

Mr. Swaroop M. Karade for Respondent No.1.

CORAM : R. G. KETKAR, J.**DATE : 28TH JUNE, 2019****P.C.:**

Heard Mr. Mandlik, learned Counsel for the applicant and Mr. Karade, learned Counsel for the respondent No.1.

2. By order dated 24.04.2019, C.R.A. filed by the applicant was dismissed. It was noted that applicant / obstructionist is interfering and / or obstructing the administration of justice and is liable to be proceeded for committing criminal contempt. In view thereof, suo motu notice was issued to the applicant / obstructionist as to why action under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 be not initiated against her, returnable on 19.06.2019. As the obstructionist had raised totally frivolous objections, the Court Receiver was appointed under Order XL with all enabling powers to dispossess whosoever is found

in possession of the suit premises by taking police assistance, if required. Respondent No.1-plaintiff was directed to deposit Rs.15,000/- in this Court as per Rule 597 of the Bombay High Court (Original Side) Rules within one week. The police officials attached to Laxmi Police Station, Kolhapur were directed to extend full co-operation for implementation of the order. The Petition was dismissed and it was kept for reporting compliance on 28.06.2019 at 3.00 p.m. Accordingly, Court Receiver has submitted compliance report dated 14.06.2019 along with copies of orders dated 24.04.2019 and 03.05.2019, typed report dated 28.05.2019 and possession receipt dated 17.05.2019, the same is taken on record and marked 'X colly.' for identification. The report shows that the possession of the suit property was handed over to the decree holder Dr.Sunita Sachin Patil on 17.05.2019. Mr.Karade confirms this fact.

3. As the possession is now handed over to the decree-holder, Court Receiver stands discharged on payment of costs charges and expenses of the Court Receiver by decree-holder i.e. respondent No.1.

(R. G. KETKAR, J.)