

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

Amk

WRIT PETITION NO. 5804 OF 2016

Sangli District Co-op. Central Bank Ltd. .. Petitioner
Vs.
Vasantdada Shetkari Sootgirni Maryadit,
Sangli & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr. R. A. Naik i/b Umesh R. Mankapure for the Petitioner.
Mr. Prakash Mahadik for Respondent No.2.
Ms. Jyoti P. Jadhav, AGP for Respondent Nos.3 & 4.

**CORAM : A. A. SAYED AND
K. K. SONAWANE, JJ.**

DATE : 13th JULY, 2018.

P.C.

1. This Petition is filed seeking following reliefs:

“(a) That this Hon'ble High Court may be pleased to issue an Writ of Mandamus or any other writ, award, direction in nature of Mandamus be pleased to quash and set aside the impugned priority list dated 17.02.2014 prepared by Respondent No.2 which is submitted to Respondent No.3 and further be pleased to direct the Respondent No.2 to prepare a fresh priority list pursuant to the order of this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No. 745 of 2012 and pursuant to the provisions of Rule 18(A) of MCS Rules, 1961;

(b) Pending the hearing and final disposal of the present Writ Petition, this Hon'ble Court be pleased to direct Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 not to act upon the priority list dated 17.02.2014 as

prepared by Respondent No.2 and submitted for sanction to Respondent No.3;

(c) Ad-interim relief in terms of prayer clause (e) may be granted.

(d) Costs be provided for

(e) Any other just and equitable awards in the interest of justice in the facts and circumstances of the case may be granted.”

2. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner states that he has no instructions in the matter.

3. The Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Societies who is a liquidator of the Petitioner Bank, has filed an Affidavit wherein it is pointed out that as far back as in June, 2014 the Petitioner-Bank has been paid an amount of Rs.3,15,43,440/- which was principal amount of loan granted by the Petitioner-Bank to the Respondent No.1-Society. The Affidavit further states that 95% of the claims have been settled and paid over.

4. In these circumstances, we find that this is not a fit case to exercise the extra ordinary jurisdiction of the Court to entertain the Petition. The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

[K. K. SONAWANE, J.]

[A. A. SAYED, J.]