



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

910 WRIT PETITION NO. 3311 OF 2024

VAIBHAV LAXMAN KSHIRSAGAR MALI

VERSUS

LAXMAN MALLIKARJUN TAMBOLKAR

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Adv.M.L.Dharashive

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

DATE : 28.03.2024

P.C. :

1] Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the original plaintiff, who has filed suit for declaration of ownership and cancellation of sale deed. During pendency of the suit, the present respondent filed application seeking police protection on the ground that the present petitioner is disturbing his possession without filing the suit for injunction. In view of the said application, police protection was granted to the respondent by the police authorities. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in view of the police protection, the respondent is

trying to dispossess the petitioner from the suit property. Thereafter, the petitioner filed an application below Exh.14 requesting to grant status quo. The trial Court, in absence of the respondent, rejected the status quo application of the petitioner.

2] Without going into the merits of the matter as status quo is prayed by the petitioner during pendency of the application for temporary injunction, the learned Civil Judge Junior Division, AUSA is directed to decide the application for temporary injunction, preferably within a period of three months from the date of production of this order.

3] In view of the above direction, the present Writ Petition is disposed of.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER]
JUDGE

DDC