



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 2135 OF 2026

Usha Maruti Jadhav  
Age : 66 years, Occ. Agriculture,  
R/o Dwarkadish colony, Alamgir Road,  
House No.456, Bhingar, Ahmednagar  
Dist. Ahmednagar.

... PETITIONER  
(Orig. J.D.)

**VERSUS**

Maohar Baburao Dolase,  
Age : 70 years, Occ. Business,  
R/o Burud Galli Chowk,  
Ahmednagar.

... RESPONDENT  
(Orig. D.H.)

Mr. Vikas S. Bhale, Advocate for Petitioner

**CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.**

**DATED : 25<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY, 2026**

**FINAL ORDER :-**

1. The petitioner impugns order dated 29.01.2026 passed in Special Darkhast No. 29 of 2019. The petitioner is judgment debtor and he suffered a decree of specific performance of contract in Spl.Civil Suit No. 179 of 2016. The respondent filed Special Darkhast No. 29 of 2019. During course of execution, draft of sale deed has been presented to Executing Court. At this stage, petitioner raised objection contending that description of property is not in consonance with description of suit property in agreement to sale,

which was subject matter of suit. The Executing Court rejected petitioner's contention by impugned order.

2. A perusal of impugned order shows that petitioner has shown her readiness to execute sale deed as per description mentioned in agreement to sale. It depicts that petitioner had agreed to sell 1/2 portion out of Gut No. 281, admeasuring 3 H 18 R (+) 9 R potkharaba. The four boundaries of land are also mentioned. The copy of 7/12 extract is available on record which suggest that petitioner has 1/2 share in Gut No. 281 and same was subject matter of agreement to sale. Apparently, petitioner is trying to protract execution proceeding by raising flimsy objection. A similar objection was previously raised by petitioner during course of execution of decree is rejected. The petitioner is repeatedly raising the same objection and trying to hurdle execution of decree.

3. In that view of matter, no infirmity or jurisdictional error is discernible in impugned order so as to warrant interference of this Court under Article 227 of Constitution of India. Hence, Writ Petition stands **rejected**.

**(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.)**

ssp