



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

4 WRIT PETITION NO. 3512 OF 2024

KISAN ALIAS KISHOR SAVLERAM KUNDAR

VERSUS

THE RANGE FOREST OFFICER SANGAMNER DIV 3 AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. K. N. Bhosale h/f Kanawade Ajay T.

AGP for Respondents-State : Mr. K. B. Jadhavar

...

AND

5 WRIT PETITION NO. 3513 OF 2024

DATTU SAVALERAM KUDNAR

VERSUS

THE RANGE FOREST OFFICER SANGAMNER DIV 3 AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. K. N. Bhosale h/f Kanawade Ajay T.

AGP for Respondents-State : Mr. S. B. Jadhav

...

AND

6 WRIT PETITION NO. 3514 OF 2024

DHONDIBA NARAYAN KUDNAR

VERSUS

THE RAGE FOREST OFFICER SANGAMNER DIV 3 AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. K. N. Bhosale h/f Kanawade Ajay T.

AGP for Respondents-State : Mrs. K. R. Jamdhade

...

AND

8 WRIT PETITION NO. 3551 OF 2024

SAVALERAM SARYABAPU KUDNAR

VERSUS

THE RANGE FOREST OFFICER SANGAMNER DIV 3 AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. K. N. Bhosale h/f Kanawade Ajay T.

AGP for Respondents-State : Mr. V. M. Chate

...

AND

9 WRIT PETITION NO. 3552 OF 2024

BAPU KISAN KUDNAR

VERSUS

THE RANGE FOREST OFFICER SANGAMNER DIV 3 AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. K. N. Bhosale h/f Kanawade Ajay T.
AGP for Respondents-State : Mr. B. A. Shinde
...

AND
10 WRIT PETITION NO. 3553 OF 2024

KISAN JIJABA KUDNAR AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE RANGE FOREST OFFICER SANGAMNER DIV 3 AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. K. N. Bhosale h/f Kanawade Ajay T.
AGP for Respondents-State : Mr. N. D. Raje
...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.
Dated : April 08, 2024

PER COURT :-

1. No notice is require to be issued in all the petitions as the order I propose to pass is innocuous and does not effect any party to the proceedings.
2. Heard the learned Advocate appearing for the petitioners and the learned AGP.
3. The application filed for the appointment of Court Commissioner is rejected by the Trial Court on account that the suit is at a preliminary stage, and if the application is allowed at this stage, it would amount to collection of evidence for the plaintiff, and as such, the Court has rejected the application.
4. I do not see any error in the order passed by the Trial Court since it

indicates that the application is filed at a preliminary stage. The plaintiff thus can move the application for appointment of Court Commissioner after the evidence of the plaintiff.

5. If such an application is filed for appointment of Court Commissioner after evidence of the plaintiff, the Trial Court would decide the same in accordance with law on merits.

6. With observations as above, all the writ petitions are disposed of.

(ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.)

vj gawade/-.