

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

909 CIVIL APPLICATION NO.2286 OF 2017
IN SAST/28612/2016

PRAYAGBAI SHANKARRAO KHARATE

VERSUS

SATYABHAMA DEORAO KADAM AND OTHERS

...

Mr. Swapnil D. Joshi, Advocate h/f Mr. Amit S. Deshpande,
Advocate for the applicant

Mr. S.A. Deshmukh, Advocate h/f Mr. O.B. Boinwad,
Advocate for respondent Nos.2 to 5

...

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.

DATE : 31st AUGUST, 2021.

PER COURT :

1 Learned Advocate Mr. Swapnil D. Joshi holding for learned Advocate Mr. Amit S. Deshpande for the applicant submits that Mr. Amit S. Deshpande has gone to Mumbai in a Court's matter. Present application has been filed for condoning the delay of 4864 days and it is pending since 2017. Still the applicant has no hurry to get it decided. If we consider the earlier orders passed on the earlier dates in continuation, the application has been adjourned only on the request of learned Advocate Mr. A.S. Deshpande to

appear for the applicant.

2 On the last occasion i.e. on 06.08.2021 it was submitted that Mr. A.S. Deshpande is having personal difficulty, as one of his relative is in hospital and, therefore, as a last chance, the matter was adjourned till today.

3 Now, the learned Advocate holding for him submits that he has gone to Mumbai in connection with the Court matter. There was no hurdle for him to make alternate arrangement if he was supposed to go to another Court. Advocate remaining busy before another Court is not a good ground for adjourning any matter under Code of Civil Procedure. Since the reasonable ground has not been shown for adjourning the matter, the application is dismissed.

(Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi, J.)

agd