



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO. 388 OF 2025

(Mohammad Akil Abdul Hajj Rizvi Vs. Moulana Riyajuddin Rizvi & Ors.)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. S.S. Taram, Counsel for the petitioner.

.....

CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE, J.
JANUARY 23, 2025

The petitioner – plaintiff is aggrieved by order dated 12/11/2024 passed below Exh. 72 by the 2nd Joint Civil Judge Junior Division, Gadchiroli, in Regular Civil Suit No. 66/2016, thereby adding Jama Masjid as party defendant no.6 on an application filed by the respondents. The trial Court found that in the plaint, the petitioner – plaintiff has made an averment that the suit property belongs to Jama Masjid, and accordingly thought it proper that Jama Masjid should be added as party defendant no.6, being necessary party.

2] The finding appears to me to be in tune with the provisions of law. If a suit is filed seeking injunction in respect of the property, the owner of the property would be a necessary party. The approach of the trial Court is in tune with the provisions of law.

3] No interference is called for in supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. The petition is dismissed. No costs.

(ANIL L. PANSARE, J.)

Sumit