

BHARAT
DASHARATH
PANDIT

Digitally signed by
BHARAT
DASHARATH
PANDIT
Date: 2021.09.03
12:52:16 +0530

3] Mr. Kalel, learned Counsel for the Petitioner, so as to attack the order of grant of injunction would invite attention of this Court to the initiation of suit being RCS No. 108 of 2009 and unconditional withdrawal of the same. According to him, since earlier suit for partition and separate possession was withdrawn unconditionally, in the second suit, Court committed an error of law in granting temporary injunction. He would further claim that the Petitioner is a purchaser of the suit property without notice and that being so, she being a co-sharer in the property ought not to have been enjoined.

4] Mr. Chavan, learned Counsel for Respondent No.1/original Plaintiff would support the order impugned. According to him, what was purchased was undivided share and that being so, Court below was justified in ordering injunction.

5] Considered rival submissions.

6] From the available pleadings and documents, it is apparent that present Petitioner has purchased undivided share in the suit property

which is claimed to be property of Hindu Joint Family. Based on the title gained by virtue of sale deed in her favour, she has claimed certain portion of the suit property which is part of common hotchpoch in the suit. Petitioner has failed to establish that property purchased at any time before, was partitioned by metes and bounds. In that view of the matter, Petitioner undoubtedly having purchased undivided share, cannot interfere with the possession of other co-owners of the suit property. That being so, order impugned granting injunction does not warrant any interference.

7] Petition as such lacks merits and same stands dismissed.

8] As a consequence of dismissal of Petition, pending Application also stands disposed of.

9] Liberty to move for expeditious disposal of partition suit.

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)