



सत्यमेव जयते

नगर दिवाणी व सत्र न्यायालय, मुंबई

City Civil & Sessions Court, Mumbai

e-Courts Mission Mode Project



[HOME](#) [ABOUT COURT](#) [SUPREME COURT](#) [HIGH COURT](#) [SERVICES](#) [INDIA CODE](#)
[DOCUMENTS](#) [NOTICES](#) [MORE](#) 

[Home](#) > [Services](#) > [Case Status](#) > Case Status : Search by Case Number

Case Status : Search by Case Number

 [Case Number](#) [FIR Number](#) [Party Name](#) [Advocate Name](#) [Case Code](#) [Act](#) [Case Type](#)[Back](#)

City Civil Court, Mumbai

In The Court Of : COURT 66 ADDL SESSIONS JUDGE

CNR Number : MHCC010048702026

Case Number : SUIT/0100844/2026

Date : 17-07-2026

The Bombay Diocesan Trust Association Private Ltd through James Baker. **Versus** Ashok Dayanand Sonule.

Daily Status

Daily Status		
Business	Next Purpose	Next Hearing Date
CORAM : H.H.J. K. S. Zanwar (C.R.NO.66) Plaintiff absent but their Adv. Daljeet Singh Bhatia present for plaintiff and tendered registered NM no.2205/2026 along-with affidavit of service. Taken on record. Marked as Exh-5. Defendant and his advocate on record absent. KB Later on at 03:23 p.m. Adv. Mehul Shah along-with Adv. Yuvraj Tribhuvan and Adv. Daljeet Singh Bhatia present for plaintiff. Perused previous Roznama dt.16.4.2026, it reveals that my learned Predecessor directed plaintiff to serve the copy of Draft of Notice of Motion to defendant through private service as he is residing at Kolhapur. Adv. for plaintiff furnished one packet. Packet reveals detailed address of defendant and an endorsement of refusal made by concerned Postal Department. He also annexed the online track report and annexure alongwith affidavit of service. From record it reveals that, defendant himself refused the service of this Notice of Motion. Perused plaint, documents on record. Heard Advocate for plaintiff. Moreover, plaintiff relied upon one agreement which is at Exh. U shows the detailed address of this present defendant. Hence, apparently, Notice was duly served upon defendant, still he is absent. Moreover, he refused to represent his side by refusing the service of Notice of Motion along-with plaint. After going through the documents below Exh. A to E, Exh. O and Exh.U, it reveals that plaintiff has a prima facie case as defendant showing himself as a Chairman and Managing Director of plaintiff trust and prepared Memorandum of Understanding. It reveals that	NM REPLYREJOINDER	24-07-2026

apparently, defendant does not have any concern with the plaintiff trust property. Plaintiff is a trust and public money is involved. Hence, considering the nature and urgency, ad-interim relief is granted to plaintiff and defendant is hereby temporarily restrained from claiming as a Chairman and Managing Director of The Bombay Diocesan Trust Association Ltd. till next date. Plaintiff is directed to comply herewith with Order 39 Rule 3 of C.P.C. Matter is adjd. for NM reply to 24.07.2026.

[Print](#)[Back](#)[Feedback](#)[Website Policies](#)[Contact Us](#)[Help](#)[Disclaimer](#)

Content Owned by City Civil and Sessions Court, Mumbai

Developed and hosted by [National Informatics Centre](#),

[Ministry of Electronics & Information Technology](#), Government of India

Last Updated: Jul 17, 2026

