



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 9434 OF 2025

SURESH SAKHARAM SHINGARE

VERSUS

**THE DISTRICT DEPUTY REGISTRAR CO OPERATIVE
SOCIETIES**

...

Mr. Sonkawade Amarsinha Dharmaraj, Advocate for the Petitioner

Mr. K. S. Patil, AGP for Respondents-State

Mr. Kamlakar J. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent No.2

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.

DATE : 31.07.2025

PER COURT :-

. Heard learned Advocates appearing for respective parties
and respondent No.3 in person.

2. The present writ petition is filed with following prayer:

“To quash and set aside the impugned order dated 16.07.2025 whereby no evidence order has been passed and also quash and set aside the order dated 23.07.2025 passed by District Money Lending Registrar/ District Deputy Registrar Co-operative Societies, Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar in application dated 23.07.2025 in Application No.8 of 2024 for setting aside the order dated 16.07.2025 has been rejected and by allowing the application dated 23.07.2025 in Application No.8 of 2024 permit the petitioner to lead evidence in the Application No.08 of 2024 pending before the District Money Lending Registrar / District Deputy Registrar Co-operative Societies, Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar.”

3. Mr. Sonkawade, learned Advocate appearing for petitioner submits that petitioner has instituted proceeding under Section 18 of Maharashtra Money Lending (Regulation) Act, 2014 and same is pending before Respondent No.1. He further submits that on 16.07.2025, petitioner's evidence has been closed. Similarly, vide order dated 23.07.2025, application for recalling of order of closing evidence is also rejected. He would submit that only because this Court has expedited proceeding pending before respondent No.1, the aforesaid steps are taken.

4. Mr. Suryawanshi, learned Advocate appearing for respondent No.2 relying upon affidavit-in-reply filed by Bhavana Prashant Munde endeavours to point out that proceeding initiated before Respondent No.1 under Section 18 of Money Lending Act, itself is not maintainable. He further submits that petitioner is just harassing respondents and despite several opportunities given to him, he failed to lead evidence. As such, respondent No.1 has rightly passed order of closing evidence.

5. Having considered submissions advanced, it appears that at least three chances were given to petitioner to lead evidence before evidence closing order is passed. Later on, application for recalling of order dated 16.07.2025 is also rejected in deference to directions given by this Court, thereby expedite proceeding.

6. This Court deems it appropriate to grant one opportunity to

petitioner to lead evidence. However, such evidence to be lead within specified time limit. Further respondents shall be compensated by granting some costs.

7. In that view of the matter, following order is passed:

::ORDER::

- a. Writ petition is partly allowed.
- b. The impugned order dated 16.07.2025, thereby closing evidence of petitioner and order dated 23.07.2025, thereby application for recalling order of closing evidence is hereby quashed and set aside.
- c. Petitioner is permitted to lead evidence before Respondent No.1.
- d. Petitioner shall bring all the witnesses before respondent No.1 tomorrow. Respondents may cross-examine such witnesses. No further opportunity shall be granted to petitioner to lead evidence. On closing evidence of petitioner, respondents may lead their evidences and entire proceeding shall be concluded within a period of ten (10) days from today.
- e. Petitioner shall pay costs of Rs.10,000/- (Rs. Ten Thousand Only) to respondents.
- f. Parties to act upon authenticated copy.

[S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.]

HRJadhav