



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 2785/2025

**Ravindra Prabhakar Ghadekar Vs. Vinod Uttamrao Hantodkar and
others**

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders
--	---------------------------

Mr. S.M. Vaishnav, Advocate for Petitioner

CORAM: ANIL L. PANSARE, J.

DATED : 10th JUNE, 2025

1. Heard.

2. The petitioner is before the Court against the concurrent findings. The respondent No.1 (original plaintiff) filed the suit against the petitioner and other respondents for eviction and recovery of arrears. Both the Courts below have noted that the petitioner and other respondents failed to pay rent despite receiving notice and further during pendency of the suit. That being so and taking aid of Section 15 of the Maharashtra Rent Control Act, 1999, both the Courts have rendered concurrent findings in favour of the respondent No.1 and thereby passed decree of eviction.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner though made an attempt to show that the respondent No.1 was not the owner of the suit premises, there is nothing in the evidence or pleadings to substantiate the said stand. In fact, the Courts below have noted

that the respondent No.1 has placed on record sale deed and more importantly the petitioner has admitted in cross-examination that the respondent No.1 has purchased the suit property from the erstwhile owner and that being so, there is absolutely no substance in the plea put-forth by the petitioner that the respondent No.1 was not the owner. The petitioner failed to show any perversity in the concurrent findings rendered by the Courts below. There is no merit in the petition. The petition is dismissed. No costs.

(ANIL L. PANSARE, J.)