

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
TESTAMENTARY AND INTESTATE JURISDICTION
TESTAMENTARY PETITION NO.19 OF 2024

Prakash Dularam Panjabi and others ... Petitioners

Jyoti Prakash Panjabi ... Deceased

Mr. Uttam S. Rane i/b. Mr. Miraj Bharapuria for Petitioners.

CORAM : MANISH PITALE, J.
DATE : MARCH 22, 2024

P.C. :

1. In this uncontested petition, the department has raised an objection that in the administration bond prepared in support of the said petition, the shareholder is a resident of Thane and not of Mumbai. It appears that the objection is raised in the context of Rule 420 of the Bombay High Court (Original Side) Rules, 1980.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners relies upon the order dated **01.12.2021** passed by this Court in **Testamentary Petition No.166 of 2020** (*Ashok Chanderbhan Choithani*). In the said order, this Court has referred to the aforementioned Rule and observed that there is no mention in Rules 420 and 422 of the aforesaid Rules that the surety mentioned in the administration bond should be from the State of Maharashtra and / or from Mumbai.

3. In view of the aforesaid position, the department is directed to take the administration bond on record and the objection raised in that regard is dispensed with.

(MANISH PITALE, J.)