MHTH010079242019



Civil Misc. Application No.408/2019

Shri Rahul Rajeev Gandhi.

.... Applicant.

Vs.

1) Shri Vivek Shashikant Champanerkar and one. Opponents.

: ORDER BELOW EXH.1:

- 1] Applicant has taken out this application to transfer R.C.S.No.264/2019 pending on the file of Ld. 3Rd Jt. Civil Judge, S.D., Thane to any Civil Judge, J.D., Thane.
- Heard Ld. Advocate for applicant. None present for opponents when called out repeatedly till 3.30 p.m. Perused application, say filed by opponent No.1 and record. On 22/09/2021 Advocate Shri Samant filed appearance pursis on behalf of opponent No.2 and undertake to file Vakalatnama on next date but till this date he has failed to file Vakalatnama or say on the application. Hence application to proceed without say of the opponent No.2.
- It appears that applicant is original defendant No.1 in the suit and filed this application to transfer the suit from Civil Judge, S.D. Court to Civil Judge, J.D. Court on the ground that valuation of the suit is less than Rs.5 lakhs. Hence Civil Judge, J.D. Court has jurisdiction to try and entertain the suit and therefore he has prayed for transferring the said suit to Civil Judge, J.D. Court.

2 Civil M.A.No.408/2019 (Exh.1) CNR NO.MH-TH01-007924-2019

The Opponent No.1 resisted the said application on the ground

that " It is upto the administration of Court and matter of

assignment as to the trial of cases either before C.J.S.D. or C.J.J.D."

Hence he has prayed for rejection of the application.

4] At the out set it is evident that applicant i.e. original

defendant No.1 in the suit filed this application praying to transfer

the suit to C.J.J.D. Court on the ground of valuation. If applicant is

having any grievance/objection about the maintainability of the

suit before the Ld. C.J.S.D. on the ground of pecuniary jurisdiction

of the Court, then he may raise the objection before the same Court

and the Competent Court can decide the same on its merits.

Section 24 of the C.P.C. does not prescribe for determining the

question of pecuniary jurisdiction of the Court. Therefore, it would

not be proper to exercise the power under section 24 of the C.P.C.

to determine the question of pecuniary jurisdiction of the Court on

the application of the defendant No.1 in the suit. Hence, I do not

find any substance in the contention of the applicant to transfer the

matter from Civil Judge, S.D. Court to Civil Judge, J.D. Court on

the ground of pecuniary jurisdiction. Hence I pass the following

order:-

ORDER

Application is rejected.

Date :-06/12/2021

(A.J.Mantri)

Thane.

Principal District Judge, Thane.