



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

916 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 14680 OF 2023  
IN RAST/35380/2023

CONFERENCE OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN WESTERN INDIA  
THROUGH ITS SECRETARY  
VERSUS  
HARISH MILIND WAGHMODE AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Gatne Atul B.  
AGP for Respondents/State : Mr. S.K. Tambe  
Advocate for Respondents : Ms. Mhase Madhaveswari S.

...

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &  
Y.G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.

DATE : 25<sup>th</sup> January, 2024

PC. :-

1. By consent of the parties, the minor delay of 87 days is condoned and the **Civil Application is disposed off.**
2. By consent of the parties the Review Application is heard.
3. After a lengthy hearing in this matter, we noticed that there is a litigating history between various factions in this trust. The Applicant concedes that the review applicant has sold 101 properties of the trust, with the permission of the Appropriate Authority. By an order dated 17.02.2006 passed at the Principal Seat in Writ Petition No.6532/2023 (Coram: S.C.

Dharmadhikari, J.), the Review Applicant namely Robert Vasantrao Gaikwad, was restrained from selling any further properties.

4. The learned advocate Ms. Mhase has informed us that the Change Report No.158/1996 was initially dealt with before the competent authority at Pune. Subsequently, the proceedings were transferred to the authority at Ahmednagar. The official file was lost. Efforts were made to reconstruct the file. Ms. Mhase informs that her client has certified copies of the entire documents of the said file. The dispute as regards reconstruction is pending before the Appellate Authority.

5. The learned advocate for the Review Applicant prays that the C.R. No.158/1996 be included in the list of the pending CRs for adjudication. It is pointed out to us that this Court at the Principal Seat has already passed an order on 02.06.2003 in Writ Petition No.3050/2003 directing C.R. No.158/1996 to be heard expeditiously. Naturally, this Court is not required to pass one more order indicating that the said proceeding should be decided. As the controversy with regards the reconstruction of the file in the said proceeding is yet to be concluded, needless to state, further hearing in the said proceeding would depend on the reconstruction of the file.

6. In view of the above, we do not think that we are required to pass any further order as regards C.R. No.158/1996.

7. **The Review Application is disposed off.**

[Y.G. KHOBRADE, J.]

[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.]