

Ashok Ramkrishna Malu ... Respondent

Mr. R.D. Soni I.by V.R. Kasle I.by Ram and Co. for the respondent no. 1.

DATE : 5th AUGUST 2025

PC:

4. The petitioner had preferred a review application before the learned District Judge, being Civil Miscellaneous Application No. 151 of 2022. The said review application was also rejected by the learned District Judge. The later order is also assailed in this petition.

5. The Trial Court had passed the order on 6th February 2020. The learned District Judge allowed the revision by an order dated 2nd July 2022. In the intervening period, the trial in the suit progressed and the Court is informed that, the written submissions have been filed, and now the suit is posted for passing the judgment.

6. In view of the aforesaid developments, at this stage, there is no propriety in entertaining this petition against the interlocutory order.

7. Mr. Shekhar Jagtap, the learned counsel for the petitioner, submitted that the observations made by the learned District Judge in Para 12 of the impugned order have the propensity to cause serious prejudice to the rights of the petitioner and may also influence the judgment to be delivered by the Trial Court.

8. It is well settled that the observations made by the Courts while deciding the interlocutory applications are for deciding the matter of the moment and should not influence the final adjudication of the suit.

9. Nonetheless, to rule out the possibility of prejudice, it is clarified that the Trial Court shall decide the suit finally on its own merit and in accordance with law, without being influenced by any of the interlocutory orders, including the order passed by the Trial Court on 6th February 2020 and the orders passed by the learned District Judge

in Civil Revision Application No. 7 of 2020 and Civil Miscellaneous Application No. 181 of 2022.

10. Subject to the aforesaid clarification, the petition stands disposed.

(N.J. JAMADAR, J)