

2023 SCC OnLine Bom 1596

In the High Court of Bombay at Goa
(BEFORE M.S. SONAK, J.)

Goa University, through its Registrar and Vice
Chancellor ... Appellant;

Versus

Haroon Ibrahim and Others ... Respondents.

Appeal From Order No. 1764 of 2022 (F) and Civil Application No.
1765 of 2022 (F)

Decided on August 4, 2023

Advocates who appeared in this case:

Mrs. Agni, Senior Advocate with Ms. Afrin Khan Harihar and Mr. Junaid Shaikh, Advocates for the Appellant.

Mr. Ashwin D. Bhohe and Ms. R. Prazeres, Advocates for Respondent Nos. 1.

Mr. S.P. Munj, Additional Government Advocate for Respondent Nos. 2 & 3.

The Order of the Court was delivered by

M.S. SONAK, J.:— Heard Mrs. A. Agni, learned Senior Advocate, who appears along with Ms. Afrin Khan Harihar and Mr. Junaid Shaikh for the appellant (Goa University) and Mr. A.D. Bhohe with Ms. R. Prazeres for respondent no. 1. Mr. S.P. Munj, learned Additional Government Advocate appears for respondent nos. 2 & 3.

2. The challenge in this appeal is to the order dated 07.07.2022, by which the Trial Court dismissed the appellant's application for an injunction to restrain respondent no. 1 from interfering with the work of construction of the compound wall to close the opening and complete the wall and restore it to the same position in which it was from 2009 to 2013 till the respondent no. 1 (plaintiff) illegally demolished the portion of the same.

3. The impugned order is made in Civil Suit No. 53/2012 instituted by respondent no. 1. respondent no. 1 had initially sought and obtained an injunction to restrain the appellant (Goa University) from completing the construction of the compound wall and blocking and obstructing the suit access claimed by respondent no. 1. However, this Court, by order dated 27.04.2017 vacated this injunction order.

4. The appellant's case is that from 2017 till 09.10.2021, the appellant did not repair the breach in the compound wall. However, when the appellant undertook to repair the breach, respondent No. 1

objected and interfered with this work. Therefore, the appellant, though a defendant in the suit, filed an application (Exhibit 129) seeking an injunction to restrain respondent no. 1 from interfering with the construction of the compound wall to close the breach.

5. By the impugned order dated 07.07.2022, the Trial Court dismissed the appellant's application at Exhibit 129. Hence this appeal.

6. This Court, made an order on 21.09.2022 (Coram : G.S. Kulkarni, J.). In the said order, some observations were made about the Trial Court not considering this Court's earlier order dated 27.04.2017 in Appeal From Order No. 53/2016, by which respondent no. 1's application for an injunction to restrain the appellant herein was effectively dismissed. This Court reasoned that once the injunction order granted by the Trial Court earlier was vacated by this Court, at least *prima facie*, there was no question of respondent no. 1 securing the same relief by *prima facie* obstructing the appellant for completing the closure of the breach.

7. Mr. Bhohe, learned Counsel for respondent no. 1, submits that the impugned order was made mainly because the appellant failed to produce any permission from the Panchayat for the construction to close the breach in the compound wall. Mr. Bhohe accepted that the findings recorded by this Court in its order dated 27.04.2017 in Appeal From Order No. 53/2016 could not have been ignored by the Trial Court at the *prima facie* stage. Again, he maintained that the appellant's application at Exhibit 129 was correctly dismissed because the appellant had not produced any licence from the concerned Village Panchayat.

8. Mrs. Agni, learned Senior Advocate for the appellant, points out that the appellant has already applied for a licence to the Village Panchayat of Taleigao way back on 21.08.2018. She pointed out that even a reminder was addressed to the Panchayat on 21.12.2021. Mrs. Agni states that the appellant would be satisfied with an order that the appellant can undertake the construction of the breach in the compound wall after the appellant receives the necessary permission from the Village Panchayat of Taleigao.

9. The Trial Court could not have ignored this Court's order dated 27.04.2017 in Appeal From Order No. 53/2016 at the *prima facie* stage. At the same time, the appellant cannot undertake construction without permission from the Panchayat. Therefore, Mrs. Agni's suggestion is fair and reasonable. The appellant - Goa University, can proceed with constructing the compound wall to close the breach subject to the appellant - Goa University obtaining construction permission from the Village Panchayat of Taleigao. An application for this purpose is already filed, and subject to such permission being granted, the injunction prayed for by the appellant in the application at Exhibit 129 can be and

is hereby granted.

10. Thus, it is clarified that respondent No. 1 will not interfere with the appellant constructing the compound wall to close the breach in the wall, provided the appellant obtains permission from the Village Panchayat of Taleigao. Further, even if the appellant gets consent from the Village Panchayat of Taleigao and completes the construction, thereby closing the breach, such structure will be subject to the final order in Civil Suit No. 53/2012. The appellant - Goa University, will claim no equities. The suit must finally be decided based on the evidence the parties lead, without being influenced by the interim orders granting or refusing interim reliefs.

11. With the above directions, this appeal is disposed of. The impugned order stands modified accordingly. The appellant's application at Exhibit 129 is disposed of in the above terms.

12. This Court has not gone into the issue of the appellant being entitled to permission from the Village Panchayat of Taleigao. All contentions of all parties in this regard are kept open.

13. The appeal and the Civil Application are disposed of.

14. There shall be no costs order.

Disclaimer: While every effort is made to avoid any mistake or omission, this casenote/ headnote/ judgment/ act/ rule/ regulation/ circular/ notification is being circulated on the condition and understanding that the publisher would not be liable in any manner by reason of any mistake or omission or for any action taken or omitted to be taken or advice rendered or accepted on the basis of this casenote/ headnote/ judgment/ act/ rule/ regulation/ circular/ notification. All disputes will be subject exclusively to jurisdiction of courts, tribunals and forums at Lucknow only. The authenticity of this text must be verified from the original source.