

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

Ravi Prakash Agarwal & Ors.

Vs.

Rajesh Prasad Agarwal & Ors.

C.A.No.1668 of 2008

(Dr.Arijit Pasayat and P.Sathasivam,JJ.)

29.02.2008

JUDGMENT

Dr. Arijit Pasayat,J.

(Arising out of S.L.P. (C) No.16312 of 2006)

1. Leave granted.

2. Challenge in this appeal is to the order of a Division Bench of the Allahabad High Court in First Appeal under Order 41 Rule 1 (r) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (in short 'CPC')

3. Backgrounds facts in a nutshell are as follows:

The appellants as plaintiffs filed a suit (suit No.445 of 1999) for three reliefs:

“(i) The sale deed executed by defendant-respondent no.1 on 22.2.1999 in favor of defendant-respondent no.3 is declared as void.

(ii) A permanent injunction be issued restraining the defendants from dispossessing the plaintiffs from the property in dispute.

(iii) Another permanent injunction restraining the defendant’s no.1, 2 and 4 from letting, selling and disposing of the property.”

4. An application for injunction was also filed. On 4.5.1999 ex-parte order of injunction was granted. The prayer to modify the same was rejected. On 24.11.2001

a consent order was passed by the Division Bench of the High Court. The Division Bench directed disposal of the suit within six months and further directed maintenance of status quo of the suit property till its disposal on certain conditions. Subsequently, application was filed by respondent no.4 by making a grievance that her counsel was not heard. It is the stand of the appellants that her defense was struck off. In any event the order was recalled on 9.1.2002. High Court dismissed the appeal holding prayer for interim injunction.

5. It is stated by learned counsel for the appellants that the order of status quo continued for nine years and by the impugned order the position has been changed. The conditions stipulated are really of no consequential relevance, as in that case during pendency of the case there may be a necessity for impleading the vendees.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents on the other hand, submitted that the order is really one of concurrence and, therefore, there was no need to repeat the reasoning.

7. We find that the order of status quo continued for considerable length of time. It would, therefore, be appropriate to direct maintenance of status quo as was originally granted by order dated 24.11.2001. We make it clear that by giving this protection it shall not be construed as if we have expressed any opinion on the merits of the case. We request the Trial Court to dispose of the suit as early as practicable preferably by the end of 2008.

8. The appeal is accordingly disposed with no order as to costs.