

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**  
**WRIT PETITION NO. 274 OF 2025**

Manju Vinit Gadgil & Anr

..Petitioners

**Versus**

Shubhada Ramkrishna Gadgil & Ors

...Respondents

Mr. Avinash B. Avhad, for the Petitioners.

Mr. Rajendra Desai, i/b Prabha Badadare, for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.

**CORAM: N. J. JAMADAR, J.**

**DATE : 30<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2025**

**P.C.:**

1. Heard the leaned Counsel for the parties.
2. The challenge in this Petition is to an order dated 7<sup>th</sup> December 2023, passed by the learned District Judge, Pune, in MCA No. 281 of 2021, whereby the learned District Judge was persuaded to allow the Appeal by setting aside the order of injunction granted by the trial Court and instead the Petitioner-Plaintiff came to be appointed as Court Receiver to run the business of Vinit Engineering Company, with a further direction to the Petitioners to furnish quarterly accounts and provide inspection of the accounts to the Respondents-Defendants.
3. The Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 are the daughters of the Petitioner. The Respondent No.1 is the mother-in-law of the Petitioner. Vinit

ARUN  
RAMCHANDRA  
SANKPAL

Digitally signed by  
ARUN  
RAMCHANDRA  
SANKPAL  
Date: 2025.10.01  
14:54:48 +0530

Ramkrishna Gadgil, the husband of the Petitioner, left behind the properties including the Vinit Engineering Company.

4. Disputes arose between the Petitioner and the Respondents over the character of the properties including Vinit Engineering Company. The Petitioner claimed that, she was the sole proprietor of Vinit Engineering Company.

5. The learned Civil Judge was persuaded to allow the Application for temporary injunction and restrain the Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 from entering into the premises of Vinit Engineering Company and causing obstruction to the Petitioner in the conduct of the business of Vinit Engineering Company.

6. In the Appeal, preferred by the Respondents, the learned District Judge found that Vinit Engineering Company was not the self-acquired property of the husband of the Petitioner. Thus instead of granting injunction to the Respondents, the learned District Judge found it expedient to make a stop-gap arrangement so that the Vinit Engineering Company remains a running concern.

7. Accordingly, the Petitioner-Plaintiff came to be appointed as the Court Receiver with a direction to furnish the accounts and also to provide the soft copy of accounts and business transactions to the Respondents for verification of the business deals and financial

transactions of the company and allow them to verify the same, as and when they demanded, with a prior 48 hours notice to the Petitioner.

8. Mr. Avhad, the learned Counsel for the Petitioner, submitted that post the impugned order, the Respondents have caused obstruction to the Petitioner in the conduct of the business and, resultantly, the business has come to a stand-still.

9. In contrast, Mr. Desai, the learned Counsel for the Respondents, submitted that the Petitioner has not furnished the accounts as directed by the learned District Judge and, therefore, the Respondents have filed an Application before the Trial Court.

10. As regards the prayer for temporary injunction, the principal dispute between the parties revolved around the affairs of the Vinit Engineering Company. As the learned District Judge found it expedient to entrust the conduct of the business to the Petitioner-Plaintiff by appointing her as the Court Receiver with further directions to furnish the accounts and also give the inspection of the accounts to the Respondents, this Court in exercise of supervisory jurisdiction does not find any justifiable reason to interfere with the order passed by the learned District Judge which balances the equities between the parties.

11. The submission on behalf of the Petitioner that despite the impugned order the Respondents have caused obstruction to the Petitioner, which resulted into closure of the business is a matter rooted

in the facts. Likewise, the contention on behalf of the Respondents that, the accounts are not furnished, as directed by the Court, would also warrant an investigation into facts.

**12.** All these contentions can be raised by the parties before the trial Court.

**13.** Thus reserving the liberty to the parties to take out appropriate Applications before the trial Court, the Petition stands disposed.

**[N. J. JAMADAR, J.]**