



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 783/2022

Bajaj Stores through its Proprietor Mr. Tekchand Jethanand Bajaj and Ors.

Vs.

Bandu Bhaurao Kasar

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

Court's or Judge's order

.....
Mr. R. D. Dharmadhikari, Advocate for Petitioners.

CORAM : MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.

DATED : 03.07.2025

1. The respondent though served, has not appeared before the Court. I have heard the learned Counsel for the petitioners.

2. The petitioners have challenged the order dated 07.08.2021 passed below Exhibit-16 in Regular Civil Suit No.60/2017 for production of documents. The petitioners are the defendants in Regular Civil Suit No.60/2017 and the respondent is plaintiff landlord. The plaintiff has filed a suit for Ejection, Possession And Arrears of Rent and Damages on the ground of *bona fide* need. One of the grounds of the plaintiff is that the suit property is required to start the business for the wife of the plaintiff.

3. The defence of the defendants is that the plaintiff has an alternate accommodation and is not in need of said shop. To prove the contentions, defendants have filed an application to produce sanction map on record. However, the Civil Judge, Senior Division, Amravati has rejected the prayer of the defendants for production of sanction map.

4. The learned Trial Court has rightly considered said application by observing the provisions of order VII Rule 14 of the Civil Procedure Code. The description of the suit property is already given. There is no need to produce the sanction map to prove the defence of the petitioners i.e. defendants. There is no substance in the petition filed by the petitioners. Hence, the petition stands dismissed.

(MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)