

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

WRIT PETITION (ST.) NO.11026 OF 2018

M/s.Palladium Properties .. Petitioner
Vs.
Divisional Joint Registrar Co-operative
Societies, Pune & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr.V.H. Narvekar for the petitioner.
Mr.S.D.Rayrikar, AGP for the respondent nos.1 to 3-State.

CORAM : R.D. DHANUKA, J.
DATE : 11th April 2018

P.C.:

. By this petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has impugned the order dated 4th April 2018 passed by the respondent no.1 thereby rejecting the application filed by the petitioner for transposition in Appeal No.66 of 2017 pending before the Divisional Joint Registrar, Pune. Six other parties have filed the said Appeal No.66 of 2017 before the Divisional Joint Registrar, Pune inter alia praying for setting aside the order dated 14th August 2017 passed by the District Deputy Registrar thereby giving direction to Deputy Registrar Co-operative Societies, Pune City (5) to register the society and issuance of registration certificate dated 24th August 2017 of the respondent no.4 by the respondent no.2 by calling the record and proceeding from the respondent nos.1 and 2 therein.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was already impleaded as party before the lower authority through its constituents of the petitioner. It is not in dispute that those

so called constituents have not challenged the impugned order which is the subject matter of the said appeal.

3. The matter is already being heard finally by the appellate authority today. I have perused the order passed by the appellate authority impugning the application of the petitioner for transposition as respondent no.7. The impugned order records the reason as to why the application for transposition could not be entertained by the appellate authority. The application for transposition has been filed belatedly.

4. In my view, there is no infirmity with the impugned order passed by the appellate authority for transposition the petition to the respondent no.7. The petitioner could have challenged independently if the petitioner was aggrieved by the said order. There is no merit in the petition. Writ petition is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

R.D. DHANUKA, J.