

proceedings and for the first time learnt about the proceedings when they came to know about the proceedings by notice dated 5th June 2023.

3. The order impugned in the petition is dated 17th October 2013. Hence, the learned AGP raises an objection for entertaining this petition on the ground that it is filed after a period of 10 years.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners relied upon the averments made in the amended paragraph 3(a) stating that the petitioners were not aware of the proceedings and they learnt about the same pursuant to the notice dated 5th June 2023. I do not find the same to be any sufficient ground to interfere in the impugned order of the year 2013 at the behest of the petitioners.

5. Be that as it may, a perusal of the record shows that the impugned order arises under the partition order dated 6th September 2001. It is not disputed that the petitioners are claiming under the sale deed of the year 2007, hence the petitioners would be entitled to claim only through respondent nos. 1 and 2 and that they are not entitled to claim any independent rights. Hence considering the aforesaid, I do

not find any reason to interfere in the impugned order at the behest of the petitioners.

6. I do not find any merit in the petition and hence petition is dismissed.

7. Needless to clarify the petitioners are always at liberty to adopt appropriate proceedings as permissible in law, with respect to rights, if any, against respondent nos. 1 and 2 through whom the petitioners claim their rights.

8. Hence petition is dismissed with the aforesaid clarification.

[GAURI GODSE, J.]