

Santosh

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 10405 OF 2025

Poonam Vijay Patil

...Petitioner

Versus

Anandrao Subrao Patil and ors.

...Respondents

Mr. Bhooshan Mandlik, for the Petitioner.

Mr. Drupad Patil, a/w Dheeraj Patil, for Respondent Nos.1 to 5.

Mrs. Savina Crasto, AGP for the State – Respondent No.8.

CORAM: N. J. JAMADAR, J.

DATED: 4th AUGUST, 2025

PC:-

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.
2. The challenge in this petition is to the orders passed by the Assistant Registrar (R8) dated 16th July, 2025 on the complaints filed by respondent Nos.1 to 5, thereby directing the respondent No.7 Society to correct the record of supply of milk by respondent Nos.1 to 5 and pay the price of the milk, so deemed to be supplied by respondent Nos.1 to 5, to them.
3. Mr. Mandlik, the learned Counsel for the petitioner, submitted that there are certain observations against the petitioner in the orders passed by the respondent No.8 which

SANTOSH
SUBHASH
KULKARNI

Digitally signed
by SANTOSH
SUBHASH
KULKARNI
Date: 2025.08.05
20:49:21 +0530

may bear upon the duties of the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner has preferred this petition.

4. The petitioner does not seem to have any locus to challenge the impugned orders as the petitioner is an employee of the society which has been directed to correct the record and pay the price of the milk supplied by respondent Nos.1 to 5. Either the society or the members of the society, who feel aggrieved by the said orders, can legitimately assail the impugned orders. The petitioner, being an employee of the society, cannot be said to be an aggrieved person.

5. As regards the apprehension of Mr. Mandlik, suffice to clarify that on the basis of the observations in the impugned order only, no action can be taken against the petitioner.

6. The petition stands dismissed.

[N. J. JAMADAR, J.]