



Jose

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA**  
**WRIT PETITION NO.140 OF 2025**

ANAND LINGAPPA MURGODI AND 2 ORS ... PETITIONERS  
Versus  
GAJENDRA PURSHOTTAM KALANGUTKAR  
AND 2 ORS ... RESPONDENTS

Mr. Pranay A. Kamat, Advocate for the Petitioners.  
Mr. Pravin Faldessai, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

**CORAM:- VALMIKI MENEZES, J.**  
**DATED :- 19th November, 2025**

P.C.:

1. Heard.

2. After examining the impugned order, it is apparent that all that the Trial Court has done is to have allowed the Plaintiff to rely upon an occupancy certificate dated 06.06.1989 and three other documents related to the same dated 16.04.1992, 30.08.1994 and 22.01.1997 are all issued by the Bicholim Municipal Council and part of public record and, therefore, partake of being public documents. These can always be exhibited in evidence, however, subject to the rules of evidence, including determining whether they are relevant to the decision in the matter.

3. The impugned order having only allowed the Plaintiff to rely on the documents, the same are yet to be exhibited in evidence. At this stage, therefore, there is no necessity of examining the legality of the order or to set aside the same. The documents may be exhibited in evidence subject to proof of the signatory, which may be proved by issuing summons to the concerned officer of the Municipal Council who may prove the documents by identifying the signature of the officer who has signed the same and deposing that the same are available in the records of the Municipality.

4. The Trial Court shall issue summons to the concerned officer on the application which shall be made by 24.11.2025 (the next date of hearing), by the Plaintiff. The summons shall be preferably made returnable within 15 days from today and the evidence recorded by 31.12.2025. The Trial Court shall dispose of the suit, considering that it is a matter remanded by the District Court and pending from 2005, preferably by 31.01.2026. Learned Advocates for the parties assure that they would cooperate with the learned Trial Judge to dispose of the suit in a time bound fashion.

5. The petition is rejected with the above observations.

**VALMIKI MENEZES, J.**