varsha

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 1134 OF 2024
IN
CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 457 OF 2023

Jagdish Ramdas Gujar and Ors … Applicants

vs.

Tata Sons Private Limited through Chairman and Managing Director … Respondent

Ms. Sweta Dadheech, Hemali Kurve(through VC) i/b. Nedumpara and Nedumpara for the Applicants.
Mr. Zal Andhayaujina a/w. Mr. Aditya Mehta, Mr. Anuj Loya, Mr. Hrishikesh Gaayakwad i/b. Mr. Shardul Amarchand Managaldas and Co. for Respondent No.1(TATA Sons)

CORAM : GAURI GODSE, J.
DATED : 24th DECEMBER 2025

ORDER:

1. This interim application is filed by the slum dwellers for intervention in the civil revision application. The civil revision application is filed by defendant no. 1 to challenge the order passed by the trial court rejecting the application under Order VII Rule 11 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908('CPC'). By order dated 21st August 2023, the civil revision application is admitted and the further proceedings are stayed.

2. The applicants are claiming to be beneficiaries under TATA Trust. The revision applicant is disputing their claim. The prayer

clause (a) in the interim application reads as under:

> "*a. To allow the Applicants above, slum dwellers, the beneficial owners of the TATA Trusts to intervene and to be impleaded as Additional Respondents. 52 to 65 in the above Civil Revision Petition for the enforcement of their rights as the beneficial, nay real owners of the TATA Trusts".*

3. The civil revision application application seeks rejection of the plaint under Order VII Rule 11 of the CPC. Hence, the intervenor's prayers cannot be adjudicated in this civil revision application. The applicants are therefore not necessary parties in the civil revision application. The grounds raised by the applicants in this interim application would have no bearing on the merits of the civil revision application seeking rejection of the plaint at the threshold under Order VII Rule 11 of the CPC.

4. The interim application is therefore dismissed.

5. It is however clarified that the applicants would be at liberty to adopt their own independent proceedings in accordance with law. It is further clarified that if such proceedings are initiated by the applicants, all rival contentions of the parties on merits are kept open.

(GAURI GODSE, J.)