

AD-12
Ct No.16
14.02.2025
(SSS)

CO 3699 of 2024

Sri Rajesh Kedia and Anr.
Vs.
Sri Randhir Kumar and Ors.

Mr. Partha Pratim Roy,
Mr. Debabrata Roy,
Mr. Oishik Chatterjee

....For the Petitioners.

1. The present revisional application has been filed against an order granting blanket status quo against the preemptees/petitioners.
2. Learned Counsel for the petitioners argues that a blanket status quo order would curtail the enjoyment of the petitioners in respect of the suit property, of which they are in occupation.
3. It is submitted that the petitioners cannot commercially exploit the property even if they want to in view of the impugned status quo order, although there is no intention on the part of the petitioners to transfer or create any third party interest in respect of the suit property.
4. It is evident, in any event, from the prayers made in the injunction application, on the basis of which the interim order has been passed, as well as

the tenor of the order, that status quo has been directed to be maintained in respect of the property, meaning thereby that the current enjoyment and/or possession of the property by the petitioners and/or any sort of user of the property by the petitioners has not been restricted.

5. What has been restricted is the creation of third party interest and/or encumbering the suit property or transferring the same in any manner in favour of any third party.

6. Hence, in the light of the above observations, I do not find any scope of interference with the impugned order.

7. Accordingly, CO 3699 of 2024 is disposed of without interfering with the impugned order in the light of the above observations.

8. No order as to costs.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)