



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

904 WRIT PETITION NO.8809 OF 2025

1. Ashalata Narayanrao Wahul
 2. Jayant Narayanarao Kale
 3. Shaila Shrikant Shaha
 4. Premchand Mangalchand Patni
- ..Petitioners**

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra
Through Secretary
Co-operation, Marketing and Textile
Department Mantralaya Mumbai.
 2. The Deputy Registrar Co-operative Societies,
Taluka Chh. Sambhajinagar.
 3. Manoj Shejwal
Age: 35 years, Occu.: Business alleged
President Marathwada region, Republican
Party of India (Kharat) Party
R/o. Gut No.237 Subhash Nagar, Jatwada Road,
Chh. Sambhajinagar.
 4. Jagjivanram Co-operative Housing Society Ltd.,
Padampura Chh. Sambhajinagar,
Through its Secretary
- ..Respondents**

.....

Mr. L. H. Kawale h/f Mr. K. J. Suryawanshi, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Mr. V. M. Kagne, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2/State.

.....

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 02 DECEMBER 2025

ORDER :

. Present petition has been filed challenging the notice dated 08.04.2025 issued by respondent No.2 Deputy Registrar in pursuance to application dated 08.01.2025 by respondent No.3.

2. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner. He submits that the issue regarding alleged membership of respondent No.3 has already been decided by the Cooperative Court. Present respondent No.4/society is the defendant before the Cooperative Court. In fact, respondent No.4 society was not having funds to deposit charges of Municipal Corporation towards the development and, therefore, the petitioner and other members had collected the amount of Rs.60,000/- and deposited the same in the Municipal Corporation. Petitioners are the members of respondent No.4 society, however, objections have been raised. When it is already decided that who is the member of the society, then again the Deputy Registrar cannot go into the said aspect.

3. Bare perusal of the notice dated 08.04.2025 would show that on the basis of complaint made by respondent No.3 the say of the petitioners were called. Now, it is for the petitioners to submit their say before the respondent No.2. There is no decision taken by respondent No.2 at this

stage and, therefore, we are of the opinion that for challenging the show cause notice, the petitioners cannot approach this Court by invoking the constitutional powers of this Court under Article 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India.

4. Writ Petition stands dismissed.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm