

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO.3598 OF 2015

Sindhu Yuvraj Patil : Petitioner
versus
Nashik Jilla Mahila Vikas Sah Bank Ltd
Nashik and ors. : Respondents.

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.3599 OF 2015**

Pushpa Madan Parakh : Petitioner
versus
Nashik Jilla Mahila Vikas Sah Bank Ltd
Nashik and ors. : Respondents.

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.3600 OF 2015**

Bharti Tushar Andhrutkar : Petitioner
versus
Nashik Jilla Mahila Vikas Sah Bank Ltd
Nashik and ors. : Respondents.

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.3601 OF 2015**

Alka Suresh Gopale : Petitioner
versus
Nashik Jilla Mahila Vikas Sah Bank Ltd
Nashik and ors. : Respondents.

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.3602 OF 2015**

Sumantai Dinanath Bagale : Petitioner
versus
Nashik Jilla Mahila Vikas Sah Bank Ltd
Nashik and ors. : Respondents.

Mr. Kishor S Patil for the Petitioners in all the Wps
Mr. S D Rayrikar, AGP, for the Respondent Nos.3 and 4 in all the WPS.

CORAM : R. M. SAVANT, J.

DATE : 08th April 2015

P.C.

1 Not on board. Mentioned for urgent reliefs.

2 The above Petitions take exception to the communication dated 6/4/2015 addressed to each of the Petitioners by which the District Co-operative Election Officer, Nashik Jilla Mahila Vikas Sahkari Bank Ltd has informed the Petitioners that their nominations are rejected on the ground that they are defaulters within the meaning of Section 73CA of the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act. It is an undisputed position that pursuant to an inquiry initiated under Section 83 of the said Act against the Petitioners who were at the relevant time Managing Committee Members, an order has been passed under Section 88 of the said Act holding the Petitioners liable for the financial irregularities that have taken place in the said Nashik Jilla Mahila Vikas Sahkari Bank Ltd.

3 Though a revision has been filed by the Petitioners against the said order passed under Section 88, in my view, the same would not make any difference in so far as the applicability of Section 73CA to each of the Petitioners are concerned. Hence the rejection of the nominations of the

Petitioners by the District Co-operative Election Officer cannot be faulted with. No case for interference is therefore made out. The above Writ Petitions are accordingly dismissed.

[R.M.SAVANT, J]