



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.1332 OF 2025

(Omprakash @ Bacchubhau Babarao Kadu Vs. Divisional Joint Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Amravati and others)

*Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.*

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. P. A. Kadu, Advocate for Petitioner.
Mr. S. B. Bissa, AGP for Respondent No.1/State.
Mr. H. D. Dangre with Mr. Rugved B. Dhore, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

CORAM: ANIL L. PANSARE, J.

DATE: 11th MARCH, 2025.

1. Heard. The proceedings under Section 73-AC of the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960 against the petitioner are pending before respondent no.1. The grievance is that the petitioner's request for adjournment has been rejected and the matter closed for judgment. The counsel for petitioner submits that this was only second request for adjournment and the respondent no.1 hurriedly closed the matter for judgment, whereas in similar proceedings connected with respondent no.7, the respondent no.1 granted several adjournment on mere making oral request.

2. As such granting or refusing to grant adjournment is matter which should be left to the authority concerned who is seized of the matters and who takes decision on the basis of all attending circumstances, however, the impatience shown by respondent no.1 in the present case, if viewed in the light of leniency shown to

respondent no.7 is something which is significant to understand the approach.

3. At this stage, the learned counsel for respondent nos.2 to 13 submit that the purpose of filing the petition would be served if the petitioner is given one more opportunity to put-forth his case before the respondent no.1. Learned AGP has no objection if the opportunity of hearing is given.

4. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that if opportunity of hearing is given, the grievance will be resolved.

5. In view of above, the purpose of filing petition would be served if the petitioner is given an opportunity of hearing before the respondent no.1. Hence, following order:

ORDER

The impugned order dated 10.03.2025 rejecting the request of petitioner to adjourn the matter is quashed and set aside. The application seeking adjournment is allowed. The respondent no.1 shall permit the parties before it including petitioner to put-forth their submissions. No further adjournment will be sought. The parties shall appear before respondent no.1 on 18.03.2025. The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

(ANIL L. PANSARE, J.)