

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

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. 15208 OF 2025

Durgesh Chandrabali Singh	..Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra & Ors.	..Respondents

Mr. Ranjeet S. Rao for Petitioner.

Mr. O. A. Chandurkar, Addl.G.P a/w. Mrs. V. S. Nimbalkar, AGP for State/ Respondent Nos.1 to 3.

Mr. Pradeep Gole for Respondent Nos.4 & 5.

CORAM : AMIT BORKAR, J.
DATE : 03 DECEMBER 2025

PC :

1. The petitioner has approached this Court to question the order of the Revisional Authority. The Revisional Authority dismissed the revision for want of compliance with Section 154-2A of the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act. The point is narrow. The statute places a condition on the exercise of revisional jurisdiction. The condition is mandatory. The authority cannot overlook it. The Court must see whether the petitioner satisfied that condition before seeking interference in revision.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner never received the loan. He submits that criminal proceedings are pending concerning the property. He submits that the liability itself is under challenge. Counsel for the society disputes this position.

He has produced the order passed by the Registrar under Section 101 of the Act. The order shows that the petitioner was present before the Registrar. It records that the petitioner accepted the loan amount. This record is a contemporaneous document. It carries weight. It binds the petitioner unless set aside by a competent forum. In such circumstances, the plea that no loan was received loses force. Pendency of criminal proceedings does not erase the admission recorded before the statutory authority. The admission stands on its own and has legal consequences.

3. When a party has accepted the loan amount before the Registrar, the statutory consequences follow. Section 154-2A requires the person who challenges an order under Section 101 to deposit the specified sum before the revision is entertained. This condition acts as a safeguard. It prevents frivolous challenges. It ensures fairness to the society by securing the subject amount during the pendency of the revision. The Revisional Authority cannot bypass this statutory command. The petitioner did not comply with this requirement. The Revisional Authority, therefore, had no jurisdiction to entertain the revision. The dismissal of the revision was a natural result of the petitioner's default.

4. There is no merit in the petition. The petition is dismissed. No order as to cost.

(AMIT BORKAR, J.)