



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

Writ Petition Nos. 2352/2024, 2354/2024, 2477/2024, 2453/2024 and 2479/2024
M/s Gokuldas Hanuman Buxha Hurkat, Hinganghat and others Vs. Agricultural
Produce Market Committee 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. C.U. Deopujari, Advocate for petitioners.
Mr. Apoorva De, Advocate for respondent no.1.
Mr. R.D.Hajare, Advocate for respondent nos.2 and 3.

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.
DATE : 14/10/2025.

1. Heard Mr. C.U. Deopujari, learned counsel for the petitioners, Mr. Apoorva De, learned counsel for respondent no.1 and Mr. R.D.Hajare, learned counsel for respondent nos.2 and 3.
2. The issue pertains to the non-payment of the amount to the agriculturist, complaints are received by APMC regarding non-payment and based on which, the APMC issued notices to petitioners, and respondent nos.2, 3 and others. Thereafter, initiated proceedings under Section 57 (2) of the Agricultural Produce Marketing Committee (Development and Regulation) Act, 1963 ("the Act" for short).
3. Considering the evidence available on record and after giving due opportunity to the respective parties, APMC Tribunal ordered the petitioners and respondent nos.2, 3 and others to pay the amount jointly and severally. This order is being challenged in all these petitions.
4. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, who submits that the agriculturist, who filed Complaints were not made a party to the proceedings under Section 57 of the Act. He submits that he has already transmitted the amount to respondent no.2 and

therefore, it is not responsibility of the petitioners to pay it.

5. The learned counsel for the APMC submits that the amount ought to have been paid by these petitioners and respondent nos.2 and 3. In view of the fact that the poor agriculturist had filed an application before the APMC, consequential proceedings were initiated.

6. I have gone through the orders passed by the Authorities and heard both parties. It is to be mentioned here that the petitioners as well as respondent nos.2 and 3 may settle their respective claims inter se between themselves.

7. In view of the above, the petitioners as well as respondent no.2 are directed to deposit the amount with the APMC within a period of four weeks from today. It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion regarding the inter se rights and liabilities between the petitioners and respondent nos.2 and 3.

8. In view of above, nothing is to be decided in the present petitions. All the petitions are disposed of accordingly.

(Siddheshwar S. Thombre, J)