



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 5689 OF 2025

Rahul Ramkrushna Wadhokar, Aged about 35 years,
Occ. Business, R/o Rokadiya Nagar, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Through its Managing Trustee – Nilkanth Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o Shegaon, Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.
2. Rameshchandra Champalal Dangra, Aged about 55 years.
3. Chandulalji Kisanlalji Agrawal, Aged about 55 years.
4. Kishor Tryambakdas Tank, Aged about 50 years.
5. Ashok Tryambakrao Deshmukh, Aged about 55 years.
6. Shrikant Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 48 years.
7. Vishveshwar Shaligram Trikal, Aged about 60 years.
8. Pankaj Gajanan Shitut, Aged about 65 years.

All are trustees of Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan,
C/o Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

RESPONDENTS

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5693 OF 2025

Nitin Gajanan Padmane, Aged about 43 years,
Occ. Business, R/o Near Gajanan Maharaj Temple,
Western Gate, at Dhanuka Compound, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Through its Managing Trustee – Nilkanth Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o Shegaon, Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.
2. Rameshchandra Champalal Dangra, Aged about 55 years.
3. Chandulalji Kisanlalji Agrawal, Aged about 55 years.
4. Kishor Tryambakdas Tank, Aged about 50 years.
5. Ashok Tryambakrao Deshmukh, Aged about 55 years.
6. Shrikant Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 48 years.
7. Vishveshwar Shaligram Trikal, Aged about 60 years.
8. Pankaj Gajanan Shitut, Aged about 65 years.

All are trustees of Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan,
C/o Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

RESPONDENTS

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5695 OF 2025

Amar Arun Sharma, Aged 45 years, Occ. Business,
R/o Bhairav Chowk, Shegaon, Tq. Shegaon, Dist. Buldana.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Through its Managing Trustee – Nilkanth Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o Shegaon, Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.
2. Rameshchandra Champalal Dangra, Aged about 55 years.
3. Chandulalji Kisanlalji Agrawal, Aged about 55 years.
4. Kishor Tryambakdas Tank, Aged about 50 years.
5. Ashok Tryambakrao Deshmukh, Aged about 55 years.
6. Shrikant Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 48 years.
7. Vishveshwar Shaligram Trikal, Aged about 60 years.
8. Pankaj Gajanan Shitut, Aged about 65 years.

All are trustees of Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan,
C/o Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

RESPONDENTS

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5699 OF 2025

Dnyaneshwar Trambak Sakhare, Aged 45 years, Occ. Business,
R/o Sai Nagar, Shegaon, Tq. Shegaon, Dist. Buldana.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Through its Managing Trustee – Nilkanth Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o Shegaon, Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.
2. Rameshchandra Champalal Dangra, Aged about 55 years.
3. Chandulalji Kisanlalji Agrawal, Aged about 55 years.
4. Kishor Tryambakdas Tank, Aged about 50 years.
5. Ashok Tryambakrao Deshmukh, Aged about 55 years.
6. Shrikant Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 48 years.
7. Vishveshwar Shaligram Trikal, Aged about 60 years.
8. Pankaj Gajanan Shitut, Aged about 65 years.

All are trustees of Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan,
C/o Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

RESPONDENTS

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5703 OF 2025

Vidhya Vijay Bawaskar, Aged about 50 years, Occ. Business,
R/o Kumbhar Wada, Shegaon, Tq. Shegaon, Dist. Buldana.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Through its
Managing Trustee – Nilkanth Shivshankar Patil,
Aged about 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.
2. Rameshchandra Champalal Dangra, Aged about 55 years.
3. Chandulalji Kisanlalji Agrawal, Aged about 55 years.
4. Kishor Tryambakdas Tank, Aged about 50 years.
5. Ashok Tryambakrao Deshmukh, Aged about 55 years.
6. Shrikant Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 48 years.
7. Vishveshwar Shaligram Trikal, Aged about 60 years.
8. Pankaj Gajanan Shitut, Aged about 65 years.

All are trustees of Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan,
C/o Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

RESPONDENTS

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5705 OF 2025

Harish Shyamsundar Wadhokar, Aged 43 years, Occ. Business,
R/o Jagdamba Nagar, Shegaon, Tq. Shegaon, Dist. Buldana.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Through its
Managing Trustee – Nilkanth Shivshankar Patil,
Aged about 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.
2. Rameshchandra Champalal Dangra, Aged about 55 years.
3. Chandulalji Kisanlalji Agrawal, Aged about 55 years.
4. Kishor Tryambakdas Tank, Aged about 50 years.
5. Ashok Tryambakrao Deshmukh, Aged about 55 years.
6. Shrikant Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 48 years.
7. Vishveshwar Shaligram Trikal, Aged about 60 years.
8. Pankaj Gajanan Shitut, Aged about 65 years.

All are trustees of Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan,
C/o Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

RESPONDENTS

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5706 OF 2025

Vanmala Tulshiram Sonone, Aged 65 years, Occ. Business,
R/o SBI Colony, Shegaon, Tq. Shegaon, Dist. Buldana.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Through its Managing Trustee – Nilkanth Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o Shegaon, Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.
2. Rameshchandra Champalal Dangra, Aged about 55 years.
3. Chandulalji Kisanlalji Agrawal, Aged about 55 years.
4. Kishor Tryambakdas Tank, Aged about 50 years.
5. Ashok Tryambakrao Deshmukh, Aged about 55 years.
6. Shrikant Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 48 years.
7. Vishveshwar Shaligram Trikal, Aged about 60 years.
8. Pankaj Gajanan Shitut, Aged about 65 years.

All are trustees of Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan,
C/o Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

RESPONDENTS

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5734 OF 2025

Rekha Pramod Deshmukh, Aged about 47 years, Occ. Business,
R/o Deshmukh Pura, Shegaon, Tq. Shegaon, Dist. Buldana.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Through its Managing Trustee – Nilkanth Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o Shegaon, Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.
2. Rameshchandra Champalal Dangra, Aged about 55 years.
3. Chandulalji Kisanlalji Agrawal, Aged about 55 years.
4. Kishor Tryambakdas Tank, Aged about 50 years.
5. Ashok Tryambakrao Deshmukh, Aged about 55 years.
6. Shrikant Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 48 years.
7. Vishveshwar Shaligram Trikal, Aged about 60 years.
8. Pankaj Gajanan Shitut, Aged about 65 years.

All are trustees of Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan,
C/o Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

RESPONDENTS

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5737 OF 2025

Gajanan Gourishankar Bhartiya, Aged 47 years, Occ. Business,
R/o Gandhi Chowk, Shegaon, Tq. Shegaon, Dist. Buldana.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Through its Managing Trustee – Nilkanth Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o Shegaon, Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.
2. Rameshchandra Champalal Dangra, Aged about 55 years.
3. Chandulalji Kisanlalji Agrawal, Aged about 55 years.
4. Kishor Tryambakdas Tank, Aged about 50 years.
5. Ashok Tryambakrao Deshmukh, Aged about 55 years.
6. Shrikant Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 48 years.
7. Vishveshwar Shaligram Trikal, Aged about 60 years.
8. Pankaj Gajanan Shitut, Aged about 65 years.

All are trustees of Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan,
C/o Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

RESPONDENTS

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5738 OF 2025

Jagdish Bhumilal Bhartiya (Deceased) through LRs

1. Kalawati Jagdish Bhartiya, Aged about 47 years, Occ. Business.
2. Anil Jagdish Bhartiya, Aged about 38 years, Occ. Business.
3. Ganesh Jagdish Bhartiya, Aged about 41 years, Occ. Business.

Petitioner Nos.1 to 3 R/o Ghandhi Chowk,
Shegaon, Tq. Shegon, Dist. Buldana.

4. Savita Pawan Bhartiya, Aged about 45 yrs., Occ. Housewife, R/o Chikhali, Tq. Chikhali, Dist. Buldana.

PETITIONERS

VERSUS

1. Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Through its Managing Trustee – Nilkanth Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o Shegaon, Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.
2. Rameshchandra Champalal Dangra, Aged about 55 years.

3. Chandulalji Kisanlalji Agrawal, Aged about 55 years.
4. Kishor Tryambakdas Tank, Aged about 50 years.
5. Ashok Tryambakrao Deshmukh, Aged about 55 years.
6. Shrikant Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 48 years.
7. Vishveshwar Shaligram Trikal, Aged about 60 years.
8. Pankaj Gajanan Shitut, Aged about 65 years.

All are trustees of Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan,
C/o Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

RESPONDENTS

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5739 OF 2025

Rekha Purushottam Karale, Aged 60 years, Occ. Business, R/o
Near Burje Patil Wada, Shegaon, Tq. Shegaon, Dist. Buldana.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Through its
Managing Trustee – Nilkanth Shivshankar Patil,
Aged about 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.
2. Rameshchandra Champalal Dangra, Aged about 55 years.
3. Chandulalji Kisanlalji Agrawal, Aged about 55 years.
4. Kishor Tryambakdas Tank, Aged about 50 years.
5. Ashok Tryambakrao Deshmukh, Aged about 55 years.
6. Shrikant Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 48 years.
7. Vishveshwar Shaligram Trikal, Aged about 60 years.
8. Pankaj Gajanan Shitut, Aged about 65 years.

All are trustees of Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan,
C/o Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

RESPONDENTS

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5741 OF 2025

Ganesh Ramesh Deshmukh, Aged about 53 years,
Occ. Business, R/o Fule Nagar, Shegaon,
Tq. Shegaon, Dist. Buldana.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Through its
Managing Trustee – Nilkanth Shivshankar Patil,
Aged about 52 years, Occ. Business, R/o Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.
2. Rameshchandra Champalal Dangra, Aged about 55 years.
3. Chandulalji Kisanlalji Agrawal, Aged about 55 years.

4. Kishor Tryambakdas Tank, Aged about 50 years.
5. Ashok Tryambakrao Deshmukh, Aged about 55 years.
6. Shrikant Shivshankar Patil, Aged about 48 years.
7. Vishveshwar Shaligram Trikal, Aged about 60 years.
8. Pankaj Gajanan Shitut, Aged about 65 years.

All are trustees of Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan,
C/o Shri Gajanan Maharaj Sansthan, Shegaon,
Taluka Shegaon, District Buldana.

RESPONDENTS

Shri J.B. Gandhi, counsel for the petitioner in all the petitions.
Shri A.R. Patil, counsel for the respondents in all the petitions.

CORAM : PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.

DATE ON WHICH ARGUMENTS WERE HEARD : NOVEMBER 26, 2025

DATE ON WHICH JUDGMENT IS PRONOUNCED : NOVEMBER 28, 2025

JUDGMENT

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as respondents in all the cases. **RULE.** Rule is made returnable forthwith and heard finally with consent of the learned counsel for the parties.

2. All these petitions involve same controversy and deal with identical orders passed by the trial Court in the identical suits filed by the respondents against individual persons seeking their eviction and possession under Section 16(1)(c)(g) of Maharashtra Rent Control Act, 1999 (for short, the Act of 1999). Since the counsel for the petitioners as well as respondents are same in all the petitions and they have advanced common arguments, all these petitions are decided by this common judgment.

3. The petitioners have challenged the order dated 21.08.2025 passed by the trial court rejecting their applications under Order XI Rule 14 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (for short, 'the Code') for direction to plaintiff to produce documents on record.

4. For the sake of convenience, the facts of Writ Petition No.5689 of 2025 are being taken into consideration. The petitioner is the original defendant in the suit filed by the respondents under Section 16(1)(c)(g) of the Act of 1999 seeking eviction and possession. The petitioner has filed his written statement in the civil suit and the suit is at the stage of evidence of plaintiff's second witness. In the midst of cross examination of the plaintiff's second witness Deepak Leeladhar Patil, the defendant has filed the application at Exhibit 206 under Order XI Rule 14 of the Code for directions to the plaintiff to produce documents about which reference is made during the cross examination of the witness. The plaintiff has submitted his reply dated 02.04.2025 and opposed the application. After hearing contentions of both the parties, the trial Court has rejected the said application by order dated 21.08.2025. The petitioner has raised a challenge to this order by way of instant petition.

5. Shri J.B. Gandhi, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in view of answers given by the plaintiff's second witness in cross examination, it became clear that there are certain documents available with the plaintiff with respect to the status of the defendant which are required to be produced on record. He submitted that the plaintiff's witness has made reference to certain receipt books, agreement as well as account books of the year 1972-73 which are relevant to ascertain the actual status of the defendant. He therefore submitted that in view of the provisions of Order XI Rule 14 of the Code directions need to be issued to the plaintiff to produce on record all the documents referred by the said witness.

6. Per Contra, Shri A.R. Patil, learned counsel for the respondents strenuously submitted that the petition is meritless and deserves to be

dismissed with costs. He submitted that the petitioner who is the defendant in the civil suit has filed an elaborate written statement and there are no pleadings with respect to the documents of the year 1972-73. As such, in absence of pleadings, the said documents may not at all be relevant for deciding the controversy involved in the suit. He submitted that the suit filed by the defendant under Section 16(1)(c)(g) of the Act of 1999 seeking eviction and possession is based on the registered agreement of leave and license dated 28.06.2011 which is duly signed and executed by both the parties. He submitted that the suit will be decided on the basis of pleadings of the parties and the documents already submitted on record. He therefore submitted that the petitioner-defendant has failed to make out any case for invoking the provisions of Order XI Rule 14 of the Code. By inviting attention to the reasons recorded by the trial Court, he justified the impugned order.

7. Rival contentions thus fall for my consideration.

8. It has to be noted that the respondent has filed the suit for eviction and possession under Section 16(1)(c)(g) of the Act of 1999 and the suit is based on the registered document of leave and license executed by both the parties. The defendant has filed elaborate written statement taking a stand that his signature was obtained on the agreement by coercion and undue influence and he has asserted his status as tenant. There are no pleadings in the written statement about any document in nature of receipts or account books or agreement of the year 1972-73. As such, the defendant has taken this stand in the suit which will be required to be proved by him on the basis of his pleadings and evidence. It is pertinent to note, the evidence in the suit has commenced and the plaintiff has examined its second witness, whose cross-

examination is going on. Although while answering certain questions during cross-examination this witness has stated that there are documents of the year 1972-73 in the nature of receipts and agreements however, the same would not be relevant for deciding the controversy, particularly because the suit is based on the registered document of leave and license executed by both the parties in the year 2011. Apart from this, the defendant has not at all put up any case in his written statement that his status has to be decided on the basis of documents of the year 1972-73, neither he has pleaded that those documents are in custody of the defendant. As such, it becomes clear that the defendant is seeking direction to produce documents only with an intention to explore new factual aspects about working of the plaintiff-Trust and inquire into the affairs of the administration of the plaintiff-Trust. There is nothing on record to demonstrate that the controversy involved in the suit can be adjudicated on the basis of those documents.

9. In support of his submissions, the learned counsel for the petitioner has invited attention to the pleadings in the written statement with respect to certain events of the year 1972-73 mentioning that the family members of the petitioner-defendant are having possession of the shop in question since that period and certain receipts with respect to donation were issued by the Sansthan at the relevant time. Perusal of the averments in the written statement in this regard show that while narrating the facts about possession of shop in the year 1972-73, reference is made to certain donation receipts, however there are no specific pleadings with respect to status of the defendant or reference to any specific agreement depicting their status. In absence of any foundation in the pleadings with respect to the documents

sought to be produced, I am of the firm view that the application at Exhibit 206 deserved to be rejected. Pertinent to note, the defendant has not filed any application under Order XI Rule 12 of the Code seeking discovery of documents. The application under consideration invoking Order XI Rule 14 of the Code is also filed in the midst of the cross-examination of the plaintiff's second witness and that too without there being any foundation in the pleadings.

10. A perusal of the impugned order shows that the trial Court has given due consideration to the relevant factual and legal aspects. Pertinently, the impugned order deals with the contentions advanced by the parties, the provisions of law and the judgments relied upon and finally records inferences that the application is filed to prolong the suit. The impugned order is well reasoned and does not need interference on any count.

11. A perusal of the documents on record and contentions advanced shows that the petitioner-defendant has submitted several other applications during adjudication of the civil suit and they are contested tooth and nail. It appears that since the defendant is in possession of the shop premises since long, filing of various applications is clearly an attempt to prolong the matter. In the backdrop of several orders in litigations between the parties, passed by trial Court and this Court and the overall conduct of the defendant, even the application under Order XI Rule 14 of the Code filed by defendant, which is under consideration, appears to be an instance to prolong the civil suit. Hence, I am of the opinion that the application deserved to be rejected with costs.

12. Having regard to the above mentioned factual and legal aspects, no case is made out for indulgence of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. However, having regard to the controversy involved, it is desirable that the civil suits are decided expeditiously. Hence, it is directed that the suits filed by respondents against the petitioners, in which the impugned orders are passed, be decided within a period of six months from the date of this judgment.

13. The writ petitions deserve to be dismissed and the same are dismissed with costs.

(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.)

APTE