

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

WRIT PETITION NO.9510 OF 2016

Shri Duryodhan Dattatraya Rananaware and another	... Petitioners
v/s	
Shrimant Malojirao Sahakari Gruhtaran Sanstha and others	... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.9763 OF 2016**

Shri Duryodhan Dattatraya Rananaware and others	... Petitioners
v/s	
Shrimant Malojirao Sahakari Gruhtaran Sanstha and another	... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.9764 OF 2016**

Shri Duryodhan Dattatraya Rananaware and others	... Petitioners
v/s	
Shrimant Malojirao Sahakari Gruhtaran Sanstha and others	... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.9765 OF 2016**

Shri Duryodhan Dattatraya Rananaware and others	... Petitioners
v/s	
Shrimant Malojirao Sahakari Gruhtaran	

Sanstha and another

... Respondents

Shri D.S. Patil for Petitioners.

CORAM : R. M. SAVANT, J.
DATE : 2nd February 2017

P.C.

1 The Petitioners in the above Petitions take exception to the orders passed by the District Consumer Redressal Forum, Satara. By these orders, the Petitioners have been directed to pay the amounts which are mentioned in the prayer clause of each of the complaints filed by the Respondents / Complainants. In view of the judgment of the Apex Court reported in 2011(14) SCC 337 in the matter of Nivedita Sharma v/s Cellular Operators Association of India and others, it is not possible to entertain the above Petitions. The remedy, if any, of the Petitioners is to approach the State Consumer Redressal Commission against the impugned orders by filing an Appeal. If the issue of limitation arises, the fact that the Petitioners were prosecuting the above Petitions in this Court can be urged by the Petitioners. Needless to state that the contentions of the parties on merits have not been dealt with and it is open for the parties to urge the said contentions before the State Consumer Redressal Commission.

[R.M.SAVANT, J]