

varsha

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 3265 OF 1997**

Hiraman Buwaji Gotarne and Ors ... Petitioners

vs.

S.D.O. Nashik Division, Nashik and Ors ... Respondents

**WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 1895 OF 2024
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 3265 OF 1997**

**WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 1894 OF 2024
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 3265 OF 1997**

Shri Tukaram Bhika Gotarne ... Petitioners

vs.

Hiraman Buwaji Gotarne and Ors ... Respondents

**WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 10150 OF 1998
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 3265 OF 1997**

Mhalsakant G. Deshpande and Ors ... Petitioners

vs.

Hiraman Buwaji Gotarne and Ors ... Respondents

Mr. Gunjan Shah i/b. P.B. Shah, for Petitioners.

Mr. Gaurav Ugale i/b. Shriram Kulkarni, for Respondent Nos. 5 to 9.

Mrs. M.P. Thakur, AGP for the State.

CORAM : GAURI GODSE, J.

DATED : 14th MARCH, 2024

P.C. :-

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 1894 OF 2024

1. This application is for bringing on record names of heirs and legal representatives of deceased-petitioner no.3. There is a delay of more than 23 years in filing the application. The reasons for condonation of delay are stated in the application.

2. Learned counsel for respondent nos. 5 to 8, vehemently, opposes the application. They have filed affidavit-in-reply opposing the said application and disputed the reasons mentioned in the application for condonation of delay. The said affidavit-in-reply is taken on record.

3. I have considered the reasons given in the application and in particular paragraph nos. 3 and 5 of the application. The reasons stated in the application are justifiable. Hence, for the reasons stated in the application, it is allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a), (b) and (c). Amendment to be carried out within two weeks.

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 1895 OF 2024

4. This application is for bringing on record names of heirs and legal representatives of petitioner no.1. There is a delay of more than 9 years caused in filing this application.

5. Learned counsel for respondent nos. 5 to 8, vehemently, opposes the application. They have filed affidavit-in-reply opposing the said application and disputed the reasons mentioned in the application for condonation of delay. The said affidavit-in-reply is taken on record.

6. I have considered the reasons given in the application and in particular paragraph nos. 3 and 5 of the application. The reasons stated in the application are justifiable. Hence, for the reasons stated in the application, it is allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a), (b) and (c). Amendment to be carried out within two weeks.

7. List the writ petition on 4th April 2024.

8. To be listed under the caption for 'direction'.

(GAURI GODSE, J.)