

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**933 WRIT PETITION NO.261 OF 2023**

**ANKUSH EKNATH SHERKAR  
VERSUS  
THE DIVISIONAL JOINT REGISTRAR CO-OPERATIVE  
SOCIETIES LATUR AND OTHERS**

...

**Advocate for Petitioner:  
Mr. Ashok Tapse h/f. Mr. Suryawanshi Prashant D.  
AGP for Respondent/State: Mr. S. P. Tiwari**

...

**CORAM: ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.**

**DATE: 07<sup>th</sup> JANUARY, 2023**

**PER COURT:**

1. The learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to change the designation of respondent no.6. Necessary amendment be carried out forthwith. Petitioner is also permitted to amend the prayer clause in the petition.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has challenged the order passed by respondent no.1 dated 07.03.2019, on account of the fact that the revision preferred by the petitioner before the revisional authority is pending for a long period of time without being taken up for adjudication. The learned counsel for the Petitioner, therefore, submits that this court would decide the legality of the impugned order by

entertaining the present writ petition challenging the order passed by the respondent no.1.

3. However I am of the view that, it is more appropriate that the revisional authority before whom the revision is filed would be the appropriate authority to decide the revision petition challenging the order dated 07.03.2019, passed by respondent no.1. The revisional authority after issuance of notice is directed to decide it as expeditiously as possible. The petitioner can move the revisional authority for taking up the matter.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in execution of the impugned order further proceedings are initiated. In view of the same, the petitioner is also permitted to move the revisional authority an appropriate application for interim orders.

5. The Writ Petition stands disposed of.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.]

marathe