

hvn

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY.
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 2922 OF 2014**

Mr. Sayed Wajidali Sangamneheri and Ors.	... Petitioners
Versus	
State of Maharashtra and Ors.	... Respondents

Mr. Uday Warunjikar along with Mr. Bhushan Deshmukh for the petitioners.

Mr. C.P. Deogirikar for respondent nos. 2 and 3.

Ms. M.S. Mane, "B" Panel counsel for respondent nos. 1 and 4.

**CORAM : ANOOP V. MOHTA,J.
DATED : February 23, 2015**

P.C.

Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally by consent of the parties.

2. Petitioner no. 5 is already expired on 8th October, 2014. Petitioner no. 1 is expired eight days back in the month of February, 2015. This petition thus survives at the instance of petitioner nos. 2, 3 and 4. Parties to take steps accordingly.

3. I am inclined to dispose of the present writ petition by setting aside impugned order dated 9th October, 2013 passed by respondent no. 1,

solely on the ground that though observed specifically by the Division Bench of this court in earlier writ petition filed by the petitioner bearing No.9684 of 2010 dated 14th February, 2011 to convert the appeal into revision under section 154 of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act and directed the respondent to decide the revision application as expeditiously as possible within the period of three months, the respondent has passed the impugned order dated 9th October, 2013 which is same and similar to the earlier order. After going through both the orders, as submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners, I have also noted that the reasons so recorded in the earlier order and the order impugned are the same. It is a “cut-copy/paste” order.

4. There is substance in the contention so raised by the counsel for the petitioners that the impugned order of course is nothing but a re-copy of the reasons of earlier order in all respects including numbers, words and comas etc. This, in my view, is not acceptable specifically when this court upon hearing the parties had quashed and set aside the earlier order passed by respondent no.1 in the appeal which was not maintainable and directed the parties to convert the appeal into revision. The scope of appeal and/or revision is totally different. Therefore, it was definitely required that respondent no. 1 should deal with and to hear the converted revision in accordance with law, which is apparently not done. Therefore, keeping all

the points open, I am inclined to set aside the impugned order with a direction to decide the revision as early as possible, preferably within the period of three months. In view of the same, Writ Petition is required to be allowed.

I, therefore, pass the following order :

5. The impugned order dated 9th October, 2013 is hereby set aside. Revision Application No. 23 of 2001 is restored to file. Respondent No. 1 is directed to re-hear the same in accordance with law, as early as possible preferably within the period of three months. No costs.

(ANOOP V. MOHTA,J.)