

Ashish

ASHISH
SAHEBRAO
MHASKE

Digitally signed
by ASHISH
SAHEBRAO
MHASKE
Date: 2025.10.09
18:40:54 +0530

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 7369 OF 2025

Green Field Rocks End CHSL ... Petitioner

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra thr. Minister
and ors ... Respondents

Mr. Aditya Lele a/w Ms. Aishwarya Gaikwad, for
petitioner.

Mr. O.A. Chandurkar, Addl GP a/w Ms. G.R.
Raghuwanshi, AGP a/w Mrs. V.S. Nimbalkar, AGP for
State.

Mr. Pratapsinh Ranavare for respondent no.7 in
person.

CORAM : AMIT BORKAR, J.

DATED : OCTOBER 9, 2025

P.C.:

1. The present petition challenges an interim order passed by respondent No.1 in a second revision proceeding. The said second revision arose from a revisional order passed by the competent authority under the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960. The original dispute pertained to an order issued under Section 79A(3) of the said Act.

2. It is not in dispute that an order passed under Section 79A(3) of the Act is not appealable. The statute does not provide for any appellate remedy against such an order. Therefore, the

only statutory remedy available to an aggrieved party is to invoke the revisional jurisdiction of the competent authority under Section 154 of the Act. This position has been consistently recognised in several judicial pronouncements, where it has been held that when the statute bars an appeal, revision under Section 154 is the proper and only recourse.

3. In the present case, the petitioner had already availed of the revisional remedy provided under Section 154. The revisional authority, after hearing the parties, had exercised its jurisdiction and passed a reasoned order. Once such revisional power is exercised, the law does not contemplate filing of a second revision before any other authority. The principle is well settled that the revisional jurisdiction is supervisory in nature and cannot be invoked repeatedly in respect of the same subject matter. A second revision would amount to an impermissible review of a revisional order, which the Act does not authorise.

4. Therefore, respondent No.1 had no jurisdiction to entertain the second revision, much less to pass an interim order therein. The exercise of power by respondent No.1 in granting interim relief in a second revision is contrary to the statutory scheme. When the authority lacks jurisdiction to entertain the proceeding itself, any interim order passed therein becomes legally unsustainable. The impugned order is, therefore, without authority of law and cannot stand judicial scrutiny.

5. For these reasons, the petition deserves to be allowed. The impugned interim order passed by respondent No.1 is quashed and

set aside. Rule is made absolute in terms of prayer clause (a).

6. The petition stands disposed of accordingly. No order as to costs.

(AMIT BORKAR, J.)