

ANANT
KRISHNA
NAIK

Digitally
signed by
ANANT
KRISHNA
NAIK
Date:
2025.11.21
19:40:29
+0530

904.RPW.170.2025.doc

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

**REVIEW PETITION NO. 170 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 15141 OF 2025**

Mrs. Manisha K. Shah

...Petitioner

Versus

District Deputy Registrar-4, Co-op Societies,
Mumbai & Ors

...Respondents

Mr. Jitendrakumar G. Damani for the Petitioner

Ms. Savita Prabhune, AGP for the Respondent-State

Adv. Yogesh Deshpande a/w. Adv. Pranav Rane for the Respondent
No. 3-Society.

CORAM : M. M. SATHAYE, J.

DATED : 21st NOVEMBER 2025

P.C.:

1. Petitioner is seeking review of orders dated 29/09/2025 and 13/10/2025.
2. This Writ Petition was heard and finally disposed of on 29/09/2025. Since certain errors had crept in the said order, a praecipe was moved by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner, seeking corrections. It was pointed out to the Court that continuation of ad-interim protection remained to be incorporated in the order.
3. Accepting the request on 13/10/2025, an order was passed thereby correcting the typographical mistake as well as adding para 12.1 recording the request of the Petitioner for continuation of the ad-interim protection. At that time, considering the facts and circumstances, a condition was imposed

for continuation of the ad-interim protection in the form of payment of Rs.1,00,000/- to the society.

4. Learned Counsel Mr. Damani appearing for the Petitioner today argued that the order may be reviewed and the amount may be directed to be deposited in the Court, instead of payment to the society. He re-agitated the issue about whether the Petitioner is in arrears and whether the calculation about arrears demanded from her are proper or not.

5. In a disposed of matter, where condition is imposed after hearing the Petitioner, for continuation of interim protection, the order cannot be modified under the review jurisdiction. No change in circumstance is pointed out. Otherwise also no ground for review of the said order is made out. A ground that calculations are not correct was argued originally also and it is not sufficient to review the order.

6. It is already noted in the order under review that payment to the society shall be without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties. Therefore I do not see any prejudice to the Petitioner as sought to be contended.

7. The Review Petition is therefore dismissed.

(M. M. SATHAYE, J.)