

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 7601 OF 2025

Sunil Babulal Shah & Ors. ... Petitioners
Versus
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. S. S. Patwardhan i/by Utkarsh Desai for the Petitioners.
Mr. J. P. Patil, AGP for State-Respondent Nos.1 to 4.
Mr. Godbole, Senior Counsel, i/by Usha Tiwari a/w Vandana
Tiwari for Respondent No.6.

CORAM: MANISH PITALE, J.
DATE : 16th JUNE 2025

P.C. :

. By this petition, the petitioners have challenged order dated 4th June 2025 passed by respondent No.1-Revisional Authority, whereby stay has been granted to an order dated 9th April 2025 passed by the Appellate Authority.

2. The petitioners are aggrieved, for the reason that there is no reasoning in the impugned order. This Court is informed that even notice has also not been issued in the revisional proceeding and yet, such a blanket stay order has been granted. The consequence of the stay order is that the order dated 25th April 2025, passed by the Assistant Registrar of Cooperative Societies, concerning bifurcation of the society, stands revived. As a consequence, the petitioners apprehend that the contesting respondent No.6 will insist upon execution of the said order, demonstrating that final relief has been granted at interim stage. This Court is informed

that the revisional proceeding pending before the respondent No.1 is now listed for further consideration on 18th June 2025.

3. In response to the apprehension expressed on behalf of the petitioners, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the contesting respondent No.6, on instructions, makes a statement that despite the impugned stay order granted by respondent No.1, during the pendency of the revisional proceeding before the said respondent, the respondent No.6 shall not press for execution of the order dated 25th February 2025 passed by the Assistant Registrar of Cooperative Societies.

4. The aforesaid statement appropriately answers the apprehension expressed on behalf of the petitioners and therefore, the instant petition can itself be disposed of on the basis of the said statement.

5. It is noted that Mr. Patil, learned AGP, has appeared on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 4 and that respondent No.5 is a proforma respondent.

6. The writ petition is disposed of, upon recording the aforementioned statement made on behalf of respondent No.6.

7. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

8. The respondent No.1 is directed to consider and dispose of the revisional proceeding on its own merits, as expeditiously as possible.

MANISH PITALE, J.