



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 6928OF 2024

Uttam S/o Vithobaji Chapre Vs. Union of India through its Secretary in
the Department of Financial Services and others

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders
---	---------------------------

Mr. K.J. Topale, Advocate for Petitioner
Mr. N.r. Patil, AGP for Respondents / State

CORAM: **AVINASH G. GHAROTE AND**
 ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.

DATED : **17th FEBRUARY, 2025**

1. Though the petitioner was a share holder of the respondent No. 10 - Bank, since 1997 it is in the year 2022, that upon information solicited under the Right to Information Act (page 27), it is sought to be alleged that the respondent No. 11 while seeking registration of the respondent No. 10 as a Co-operative Bank from the respondent No. 3 / Reserve Bank of India had submitted incorrect information, regarding his employment, which according to the learned counsel for the petitioner adversely affects upon the grant of banking license to the respondent No.10.

2. The learned Assistant Government Pleader relies upon the judgment in **Kewal Krishan Puri Vs. State of Punjab, (1980) 1 SCC 416** and **M.S. Sanjay**

Vs. Indian Bank and others of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 1188/2025 arising out of SLP(C) No. 26695/2019.

3. Considering the fact, that the respondent No. 10 has been granted registration to function as a Cooperative bank in 1997 and the petitioner was a share holder of the respondent No. 10 Bank since 1997 and so also the fact that the bank has been functioning as such from 2000 onwards, in view of the registration dated 16.6.2000 (page 35), in pursuance to which, lakhs of transactions have already taken place, we are not willing to entertain the plea of the petitioner of an enquiry against the respondent Nos. 10 and 11 vis-a-vis its registration by the respondent No. 3. Insofar as the plea that the CEO appointed by the respondent No. 10, has not been approved by the RBI, the petitioner is free to take whatever steps under the relevant statute, as permissible in law. The petition is, therefore, dismissed. No costs.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(AVINASH G. GHAROTE, J.)