

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 7524 OF 2025**

Ansar Khallil Peerzada

..Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra Through The
Government Pleader & Ors

...Respondents

Mr. Vivek Salunkhe, i/b Anusha Pradhan Jaibhave, for the Petitioners.
Adv Nikita Lad, i/b Sagar Legal, for Respondent No.3.
Mr. Vivek M. Punjabi, with P.R. Jain, for Respondent No.5.
Respondent.

CORAM: N. J. JAMADAR, J.

DATED : 25th JULY 2025

P.C.:

- 1.** Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.
- 2.** The challenge in this Petition is to an ad-interim order passed by the Wakf Tribunal in Wakf Application No. 35 of 2025, dated 12th June 2025, thereby staying the operation and execution of the order dated 11th June 2025 passed in File No. 42/15/2007.
- 3.** By the said order dated 11th June 2025, the Chief Executive Officer, Maharashtra State Wakf Board had permitted the Petitioner to perform the rituals on account of Urs on 12th June 2025 and 13th June 2025, with a further direction that the Urs be performed along with recorded trustees mentioned in Schedule-I, who were then alive.

ARUN
RAMCHANDRA
SANKPAL

Digitally signed by
ARUN
RAMCHANDRA
SANKPAL
Date: 2025.07.28
14:39:16 +0530

4. Mr. Salunkhe, the learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that in the intervening period, there has been a significant development. The Change Report filed by the Petitioner has been accepted, and the Change Report filed by the Respondent has been rejected by the Wakf Board by orders dated 22nd July 2025. In view of the aforesaid development, the Petition deserves to be disposed. Mr. Salunke further submits that it is necessary to clarify that the order dated 12th June 2025, impugned in this Petition, was restricted to the Urs for the year 2025, lest the Petitioner may suffer prejudice in future.

5. The learned Counsel for the Respondent opposes the said prayer.

6. Since the Chief Executive Officer had passed the order dated 11th June 2025, for the reason that the Change Reports were then sub judice, and thus interim arrangement was made only for 12th June 2025 and 13th June 2025, neither the order dated 11th June 2025 passed by the Chief Executive Officer nor the impugned order dated 12th June 2025, passed by the Wakf Tribunal (which were primarily for regulating the matter for the moment) would enure for the benefit of either parties, in future.

7. With the aforesaid clarification, Petition stands disposed.

[N. J. JAMADAR, J.]