



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

MISC. CIVIL APPLICATION (TR.) NO.312 OF 2025

Dilip Shamlalji Katakwar Vs. State of Maharashtra and ors.

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

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Mr.VA.Dhabe, counsel for the applicant.
Mr.D.V.Chauhan Government Pleader a/b Ms Sonia Thakur AGP for non
applicant state.

CORAM : MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 10/07/2025.

1. The applicant has filed this application to transfer MJC No.127 of 2024, pending before Principal District Judge, Bhandara to the Court of District Judge at Nagpur.

2. The grievance of the applicant is that he has filed the review application along with condonation of delay and stay application. The Court has condoned the delay and not decided the application for stay. During the pendency, the property of the applicant was destroyed by the respondents and the grievance of the applicant is that as the stay was not granted, he has to face loss and has made the grievance against the Principal District Judge, Bhandara that for 25 months he has not decided his stay application.

3. The notices were issued in this application and the report was called from the concerned Court. The Court has given the reasons. The appeal, which was filed

by the applicant is rejected by the District Judge. Said order was challenged before this Court. It was challenged on the ground that the amendment application, which was filed along with the appeal was not decided and considered by the Court and therefore, this Court has allowed the applicant to withdraw the petition by granting the stay for ten weeks and liberty was granted to file review application before the same Court. Status quo was continued. The District Court has decided the application for condonation of delay on 08.07.2024 and his grievance is that at that time, the stay application was not decided and still the review application is pending before the District Court.

4. The learned Government Pleader has stated that only because the stay application is not decided, this transfer application is filed, which cannot be the ground to transfer the matter from Principal District Judge, Bhandara to any other Court.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the applicant and the learned Government Pleader.

6. It was brought to the notice of this Court that stay application was not decided for 25 months. The review application is filed by the applicant, which should be decided by the same Court.

7. I have gone through the report filed by the Principal District Judge, Bhandara. There are applications filed by the applicant for grant of adjournment. Only grievance is about not deciding the matter at the earliest

stage, the direction is given to the Principal District Judge Bhandara to decide the review petition within a period of one month.

8. The *status quo* is granted till the decision of the review petition.

9. For the reasons stated above, no grounds for transfer are made out. Hence, the application is rejected.

JUDGE