



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

**6 WRIT PETITION NO. 7884 OF 2023**

WITH CA/2272 OF 2024 IN WP/5565/2023 WITH  
CA/2278 OF 2024 IN WP/5716/2023 WITH CA/2267 OF  
2024 IN WP/5712/2023 WITH CA/2266 OF 2024 IN  
WP/7752/2023 WITH CA/2270 OF 2024 IN WP/5711/  
2023 WITH CA/2268 OF 2024 IN WP/5717/2023 WITH  
CA/2279 OF 2024 IN WP/5713/ 2023 WITH CA/2275 OF  
2024 IN WP/5715/2023 WITH CA/2274 OF 2024 IN  
WP/7884/2023 WITH CA/2277 OF 2024 IN WP/7958/  
2023 WITH CA/2276 OF 2024 IN WP/7885/2023 WITH  
CA/2271 OF 2024 IN WP/7752/ 2023 WITH CA/2273 OF  
2024 IN WP/12503/2023 WITH CA/2269 OF 2024 IN  
WP/5710/2023 WITH WP/5565 OF 2023 WITH CA/6259  
OF 2023 IN WP/5565/2023 WITH WP/5620 OF 2023  
WITH WP/5713 OF 2023 WITH WP/5715 OF 2023 WITH  
WP/5710 OF 2023 WITH WP/5712 OF 2023 WITH WP/  
5717 OF 2023 WITH WP/5716 OF 2023 WITH WP/ 5711  
OF 2023 WITH CA/6940 OF 2023 IN WP/5711/2023 WITH  
CA/6939 OF 2023 IN WP/5717/2023 WITH WP/7958 OF  
2023 WITH WP/7885 OF 2023 WITH WP/7752 OF 2023  
WITH WP/9733 OF 2023 WITH WP/12503 OF 2023

MILIND RAMDAS PATIL AND ANOTHER  
**VERSUS**  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY &  
ORS.

.....

Advocates for respective Petitioners : Mr. V. D. Hon (Senior  
Counsel) i/b Mr. Shinde A. D., Mr. S. V. Dixit, Mr. N. D.  
Sonawane, respectively.

AGP for Respondent/s-State : Mr. A. S. Shinde.  
Advocate for Respondent Nos. 5 & 6 : Mr. R. N. Dhorde (Senior  
Counsel) i/b Jadhav Chetan T.

Advocates for respective respondents : Mr. A. G. Talhar, Mr. K.  
B. Jadhav.

.....

**CORAM : S. G. MEHARE, J.**  
**DATE : 01.03.2024**

**PER COURT :-**

1. Learned senior counsel for the respondents Mr. Dhorde submits that revision is the remedy after the decision of the Appellate Court. He has referred to Section 9 of the Maharashtra Money Lending (Regulation) Act, 2014. He submits that since the revision is the remedy, the writ petitions could not be entertained.

2. The learned senior counsel Mr. Hon submits that today the matters were listed only for amendment. By way of amendment, they wanted to challenge the vires of the Act of 2014. He would submit that this Court has passed an order under Section 9 of the said Act and it is subjudiced before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Since this point is raised in an application for vacating interim order, time granted to the respective learned counsels for the parties to argue first on the tenability of these writ petitions.

3. Stand over to 12.03.2024.

4. Interim relief, if any, to continue till next date.

**(S. G. MEHARE, J.)**

...

vmk/-