

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 1453/2017

Pragati Ayudogik Bahu-Uddeshiya Gramin Sahakari Sanstha Maryadit Thru Sahare Pannalal
Gopichandji

..VS..

The State of Maharashtra & ors.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

CORAM : Z.A.HAQ, J.
DATED : 04/02/2019

Heard Shri S.K. Tambde, Advocate for the petitioner, Ms. T.H. Khan, AGP for the respondent no. 1 and Shri O.A. Ghare, Advocate for the respondent no. 2.

By this petition, the petitioner has challenged the order passed by the respondent no. 1 directing exclusion of name of its representative from the list of voters. The learned advocate for the respondent no. 2 has pointed out that the elections of the respondent no. 2 – Bank are stayed by the Division Bench of this Court while considering the writ petitions which are pending. The learned advocate for the respondent no. 2 has submitted that the elections are delayed by more than a year and the entitlement/eligibility of the petitioner to participate in the elections which may be held after further orders are passed by the Division Bench will have to be considered. It is submitted that there is every chance that for the elections, fresh process may be conducted. It is submitted that in these facts, nothing survives in the petition.

In the facts of the case, in my view, the following order would sub-serve the ends of justice:-

(a) Accepting the submission made on behalf of the respondent no. 2, the writ petition is **disposed** as infructuous.

(b) However, if the impugned order affects the right of the petitioner to participate in the election, the petitioner will be at liberty to revive this writ petition after serving the copy of the application on the advocates representing the respondents.

(c) In the circumstances, the parties to bear their own costs.

JUDGE

Ansari