

Amberkar

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

APPEAL FROM ORDER NO. 341 OF 2026
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 2607 OF 2026

K. Ramesh alias Koutarapu Ramesh

Appellant

.. (Org. Defendant No. 1)

Versus

1. K. Uma Rao alias Uma Sambasirao Koutarapu

Respondent No. 1

.. (Org. Plaintiff)

2. N. Geeta

Respondent No. 2

.. (Org. Defendant No. 2)

.....

- Mr. Prakash Nichani a/w Ms. Shreya Karhade, Advocates for Appellant
- Mr. Rajesh Singh, Advocate for Respondent No. 1

.....

CORAM : MILIND N. JADHAV, J.

DATE : APRIL 30, 2026

P. C.:

1. Mentioned at the time of rising.
2. Heard Mr. Nichani, learned Advocate for Appellant - Org. Defendant No. 1 and Mr. Singh, Advocate for Respondent No. 1 - Org. Plaintiff.
3. For the sake of convenience, the parties shall be referred to in terms of their status before the Trial Court.
4. Suit is filed in the 2024. It is filed by mother against the son. By virtue of the impugned order dated 20.02.2026 which is now

fructified into a final order, for the past more than one and half years since November 2024, the properties, credits and assets which are in the hands of Defendant - son have been frozen rendering him completely helpless from using them. Said position cannot be allowed to remain for ever since undoubtedly it prejudices the rights rather substantive rights of livelihood of Defendant - son. Hence I am inclined to accept the submissions made by Mr. Nichani which are also incidentally in above facts duly supported by Mr. Singh, learned Advocate appearing for Plaintiff - mother that if the Suit is expedited, it would be appropriate for the parties to end the *lis* between them.

5. In the above peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, no purpose will be served in keeping the present Appeal from Order (AO) pending in this Court. Rather it will add to the ignominy of the Defendant who is suffering the effect of injunction for the past one and half years and also the Plaintiff - mother who is of advanced age. Rather she is a super senior citizen and Defendant No. 1 - son is a senior citizen. In that view of the matter, I request the Trial Court to dispose of the present Suit as expeditiously as possible and in any event within a period of six months from today.

6. Defendant No. 1 had filed Motion for vacating the injunction order which was rejected. This rejection will not come in a way of the Defendant in the present case. This is because the Trial Court is

directed by this Court to now dispose of the Suit finally in the above peculiar facts and circumstances. Observations and findings made in the interlocutory order will not be held against any of the parties. Suit will be determined on the basis of the evidence led by Plaintiff - mother and the evidence in rebuttal led by Defendant No. 1 - son in accordance with law.

7. I am informed that Defendant No. 2 is the daughter of the Plaintiff and she is also a party to the Suit whose contentions are also expressly kept open.

8. With the above directions, present Appeal from Order and Interim Application are both disposed.