IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD
WRIT PETITION NO. 14808 OF 2026
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 12778 OF 2026
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 12780 OF 2026
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 12781 OF 2026

1. Ghanshyam Onkarlal Agrawal,
Age. 71 years, Occ. Agriculture,
R/o. Plot No. 40, Chanda Gauri Nagar
Yawal Road, Chopda,
Tq. Chopda, District Jalgaon.

2. Chopda Kasbe Vividh Karyakari Seva
Sahakari Society Limited Chopda,
Tq. Chopda, District Jalgaon,
Through its authorized officer
Rajendra Tanaji Mahajan
Age. 58 years, Occ. Service,
Motha Mali Bala Chopda
Tq. Chopda, District Jalgaon. … **Petitioners**

Versus

1. The District Co-operative Election
Authority and the Divisional
Joint Registrar, Co-operative Societies,
Nashik Division, Nashik.

2. The District Deputy Registrar
Co-operative Societies, Jalgaon
District Jalgaon and the Returning Officer
for the election of Jalgaon District Central
Co-operative Bank Ltd. Jalgaon.

3. The Assistant Registrar,
Co-operative Societies, Chopda,

Tq. Chopda, District Jalgaon. … **Respondents**

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. V.D. Hon (Senior Counsel) a/w. Mr. Harshvardhan A Kahad i/b. Mr. A.V. Hon.
Addl. G.P. for Respondent/s – State : Mr. K.S. Hoke Patil
Advocate for Respondent Nos. 1 & 2 : Mr. V.H. Dighe
Advocate for Intervenor in CA no. 12778/2026 : Mr. R.N. Dhorde i/b. Mr. V.R. Dhorde
Advocate for Intervenor in CA no. 12781/2026 : Mr. H.V. Patil
Advocate for Intervenor in CA no. 12780/2026 : Mr. V.D. Salunke h/f. M.V. Salunke

…

CORAM : MANJUSHA A. DESHPANDE, J.
DATE : 26.10.2026

JUDGMENT :

1. Rule. Rule is made returnable forthwith and heard finally with the consent of the parties.

2. The Petitioners are challenging the order dated 13.10.2026 passed by the District Co-operative Election Authority and Divisional Joint Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Nashik, Division Nashik.

It is the case of the petitioners that, Petitioner no. 1 is a member of Petitioner no. 2 – Society. Petitioner No. 2 – Society, is a member of Jalgaon District Central Co-operative Bank Limited, Jalgaon (JDCC). The name of Petitioner no. 2 – Society, is included in the provisional voters' list of the JDCC in the ensuing elections for the year 2026 to 2031. The impugned

order is challenged by the Petitioners on the background of the fact that, initially the name of one Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi was forwarded to be included in the provisional voters' list as a delegate of the Petitioner no. 2 – Society. Petitioner no. 2 – Society, had passed a resolution on 27.08.2026, which was forwarded to Respondent no. 3 – Assistant Registrar, Co-operative Society, Chopda. Accordingly, the name of Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi was included in the provisional voters' list. However, due to the ill-health of Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi, on advice of doctor she resigned as a delegate of the Society on 25.09.2026, and requested that, any other member may be considered for representing the Society. Her resignation dated 25.09.2026, a meeting of the society was called and on 05.10.2026, a fresh resolution was passed accepting resignation of Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi and the same meeting the members of the managing committee, resolved to substitute Petitioner no. 1 in place of Smt. Rama Gujrathi. This resolution was passed by majority of the members of the management committee on 05.10.2026.

3. After receiving the resolution passed by Petitioner

no. 2, Respondent no. 1 has called report from Respondent no. 3 – Assistant Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Chopda, and thereafter, has passed the impugned order in exercise of powers under Rule 11 of the Maharashtra Co-operative (Election to Committee) Rules, 2014 (for short 'the Rules of 2014'). While passing this order Respondent no. 1 has refused to substitute the name of Petitioner no. 1 in place of Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi, on the ground that Rule 10 (4) of the Rules of 2014, permits substitution of name of a representative, upon his resignation as a member and not in case of resignation by a delegated representative. Even though, it is stated in the resolution passed by the Society that the representative has resigned due to ill-health. Respondent no. 1 has held that such substitution is contrary to the provision, for substitution under Rule 10 (4) of the Rules of 2014, thereby refused to make change in the name of representative of Petitioner no. 2 – Society.

4. The Learned Senior Advocate V.D. Hon, submitted that even though, the name of Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi was included in the provisional voters' list on the basis of the resolution passed by Petitioner no. 2 – Society. She has

communicated her inability to represent the Society, due to her ill-health. Upon bed rest advised by the doctor, she has tendered her resignation as a delegate of the Society on 25.09.2026. While doing so she has tried to ensure participation of Petitioner no. 2 in the election of JDCC bank by requesting to substitute her name in the voters' list. In view of her resignation a meeting was immediately called for substitution of the voter on behalf of Petitioner no. 2 – Society in the voters list. The said meeting was convened on 05.10.2026, in which the majority members of the managing committee decided to send the name of Petitioner no. 1, as a delegate to be included in the voters' list in place of Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi. This resolution was forwarded by the Assistant Registrar, Co-operative Societies to Respondent no. 1 on 05.10.2026, itself and the impugned order has been passed on 13.10.2026.

5. He submits that upon receiving the order dated 13.10.2026, the Petitioners have immediately approached this Court by filing Writ Petition on 17.10.2026, for which circulation has been granted on 21.10.2026. This Court has issued notice on 21.10.2026 and considering the urgency, notice

was made returnable on 26.10.2026.

6. He submitted that considering that the voters' list has already been finalized and at any moment the election programme is likely to be declared, the matter therefore is required to be decided at the earliest. Referring to Rule 10 (4) of the Election Rules 2014, he submitted that Respondent no. 1 has passed the impugned order applying totally perverse interpretation to Rule 10 (4) of the Election Rules 2014. It is submitted that this Rule takes care of the emergent situation, so as to ensure that a society does not go unrepresented in the elections. There are various eventualities that may arise after preparation of the provisional voters' list, till the voting rights are exercised, such as death of a representative, disqualification of a representative on adjudication by the competent authority or resignation by a representative. In addition to aforementioned eventualities, there may be various other unforeseen eventualities that may require substitution of the representative of a Society.

7. In the present case, a valid resolution has been passed by Petitioner no. 2, by a majority committee members accepting

the resignation of Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi and nominating Petitioner no. 1 as a delegate in place of Rama Gujrathi. This resolution delegating name of the Petitioner is validly passed and not challenged by any of the member of their Society. It is submitted that, since Rule 10 (4) of the Election Rules 2014 provides that a change in the name is permitted not later than five days before the last date for making nominations. A valid resolution has been passed much prior to the declaration of nomination by the District Co-operative Election Authority.

8. He submits that Rule 10 (4) of the Election Rules 2014, has been incorporated so as to ensure that the member of the federal Society does not go unrepresented. In support of his submission, he would rely on decision of this Court in case of **Sangali Urban Co-operative Bank Versus The State of Maharashtra, reported in 2015 (5) ABR 339,** where this Court has taken a view that although Rule 10 (4) postulates a time frame within which the application is to be made for substitution, a purposive interpretation is required to be given to the said Rule. Strict application of said Rule cannot be expected. In appropriate cases the delegate can be allowed to be

changed.

9. Reliance is also placed on the decision of this Court in **Writ Petition no. 11797/2021, in Dr. Suresh Shamrao Patil Versus The State Co-operative Election Commission, and Others.** The Subject matter of the Writ Petition was in respect of the same Society, involving the present Petitioner no. 1, whose name was forwarded to substitute name of the nominated candidate, Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi, who also happen to resign as a delegate of Petitioner no. 1 – Society for the elections conducted in the year 2021, where this Court has taken a view that as per Rule 10(4), a Society can change representative in the event of circumstances like death or newly elected committee or resignation by existing representative. When an objection was raised for such substitution, the objection was turned down by this Court.

10. He submits that although Rule 10 (4) of the Rules of 2014, is clear and it permits substitution of the name of representative due to perverse interpretation of that Rule by Respondent no. 1, grave prejudice is caused to the Petitioner. As consequence of the order, Petitioner no. 2, would go

unrepresented in the elections of the Jalgaon District Central Co-operative Bank.

11. It is submitted that although the Petitioners have taken all the possible and appropriate steps as provided in the Rules of 2014, the petitioner right to vote has been taken away due to the absurd interpretation given to Rule 10 (4) of the Rules of 2014. The case of the petitioner is also supported by intervention application filed by Smt. Rama Pravin Gujarathi. Advocate Shri V.D Salunke, has supported the challenge raised by the petitioners. He submitted that the order impugned is passed, in an arbitrary manner, thus interference at the hands of this Court is necessary.

12. In response to the intervention Application filed by one Jijabai Sahebrao Patil as well as the intervention Application filed by Yogesh Shivaji Patil. Mr. Hon, submitted that the intervenors are not necessary parties to the present Writ Petition, since the challenge is limited to the extent of the order passed by Respondent no. 1. The proposed intervenors were not parties before Respondent no. 1. They have not filed any objection to the resolution nominating the Petitioner no. 1.

Hence, they cannot be allowed to intervene in the present writ petition.

13. Per contra, Mr. V.H. Dighe for all the Respondents submitted that Rule 10 (4) of the Rules of 2014, provides that, only in case of resignation by a representative of the membership of the Society, substitution can be permitted. In the present case, the resignation tendered by Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi was limited to the extent of her nomination as a delegate to represent the Society and participate in the elections. Only in case all the ties as a member of Society are severed by way of resignation, such substitution is permissible and it would be in consonance with the Rule 10 (4) of the Rule of 2014. He submitted that if at all the Petitioners are aggrieved by the order passed by the District Co-operative Election Authority, they have a remedy of filing dispute under Section 91 read with Rule 78 of the Rule of 2014.

14. He further submitted that the election programme of the Jalgaon District Central Co-operative Bank, has already been declared on 23.10.2026. According to the Election programme, the eligible candidates would be filling their

nominations between 26.10.2026 and 30.10.2026. Hence according to him, since the election programme has been set in motion, any order passed at this stage would amount to causing interference in the elections of the Jalgaon District Central Co-operative Bank.

He further submitted that it is the consistent view reflected in catena of judicial pronouncement of this Court as well as Hon'ble Supreme Court that, once the election programme is declared it should not be interfered, by the Courts by passing any orders. He would submit that, even preparation of provisional voters' list is regarded as an intermediate stage of election and this Court has, therefore, refused to cause interference even in the provisional voters' list. Thus according to him this Court should not interfere at this stage since election programme has already been declared, any changes / substitution is permissible in voters list only five days prior to the last date of making nominations. This view has been taken in the decision of this Court in the case of **Dattatraya Genaba Lole and Others Versus Divisional Joint Registrar, Co-operative Societies and Others, reported in 2022 (1) Bom.**

C.R. 471.

15. Learned Senior Advocate Mr. V.R. Dhorde, as well as Mr. Hanumant V. Patil, who have filed respective Applications for intervention on behalf of Jijabai Sahebrao Patil and Yogesh Shivaji Patil, respectively, have opposed the prayer made by the Petitioner on the ground that, only in case the representative resigns from the membership of society whom he represents. Rule 10 (4) of the Rules of 2014, permits substitution of representative that too before five days of the last date for nomination. They have also relied on certain decision of this Court as well as Hon'ble Supreme Court to contend that, interference by this Court at this stage is not permissible.

16. I have heard the learned Advocate for the Petitioner as well as the learned Advocate representing contesting Respondents. So far as tenability of the intervention application is concerned, the Applicant Jijabai Sahebrao Patil is the member of Petitioner no. 2 – Society, who is opposing the substitution of name of Petitioner no. 1. The Application for intervention filed by her would not be permissible for the reason that she has not

filed any objection to the resolution passed by Petitioner no. 2 and she was not a party to the proceedings before respondent no. 1, hence intervention application at this stage cannot be allowed.

17. Similarly, the Applications filed by one Mukesh Ramesh Patil and Yogesh Shivaji Patil, respectively, cannot be allowed since they are also not party to the proceeding before the respondent no. 1 and the Petitioner no.2 – Society has unanimously passed the resolution for substitution of name of Petitioner no. 1. Hence the intervention application, of the above applicants are not maintainable.

18. So far as challenge to the impugned order is concerned, the issue involved in the present Writ Petition is :

i. Whether substitution of name of the representative of a society, who has resigned as a delegate is permissible under Rule 10(4) of the Election Rules of 2014 ?

ii. Whether at this stage it would be permissible to make changes in the voters' list in view of declaration of the election programme ?

19. It is not in dispute that one Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi was initially nominated to represent the Petitioner no. 2 – Society in the ensuing elections of the Jalgaon District Central Co-operative Bank, by way of resolution passed by the Managing Committee on 27.08.2026. In view of her inability to represent Petitioner no. 2 as its delegate, she tendered her resignation as a delegate of Petitioner no. 2. On receiving her resignation a meeting for substituting her name was called immediately on 05.10.2026 and a valid resolution by the majority of managing Committee members has been passed, accepting her resignation and validly nominating Petitioner no. 1. This resolution is not challenged by any member of Petitioner no. 2 – Society. Respondent no. 3 on receiving the resolution, has forwarded it to the Respondent no. 1 with positive recommendation. In spite of that Respondent no. 1 has refused the substitution of Petitioner no. 1 as a delegate of Petitioner no. 2 Society, by holding that Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi has not tendered her resignation of her membership of the petitioner no. 2 - Society, but has given resignation to her nomination by petitioner no. 2, which is not in consonance with Rule 10 (4) of

the Election Rules, thereby refusing the proposal for substitution of name of petitioner no.1 in the voters list in exercise of his powers under Rule 11 of the Elections Rules.

Rule 10 (4) of the Election Rules of 2014, reads thus :

> "**Rule - 10. Particulars to be included in the provisional list of voters for the societies having society or society and individuals as members:**
>
> *(4) A society which has communicated the name of its representative shall, by like resolution, be permitted to change the name of its representative only in case of death of the representative or where there is newly elected committee of the member society not later than five days before the last date for making nominations.*"

20. This Rule has been introduced by way of amendment on 03.08.2021. By way of this amendment, the change in name of representative is permitted only in case of death of representative or resignation by the representative or if such representative is found to be disqualified on adjudication by the competent authority under the provisions of law. This newly introduced eventualities permitting substitution of names had fallen for consideration of this Court in Writ Petition no. 11797/2021, decided on 26.10.2021. Incidentally, in similar set

of facts objection was raised to the substitution of name of Petitioner no. 1 in the said Writ Petition which incidently involved Petitioner no. 1 and same candidate namely Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi who had resigned even then in the year 2021, expressing her inability to represent Petitioner no. 2 – Society in the elections. This Court has turned down the challenge raised to the substitution, of present Petitioner no. 1 and upheld his inclusion in the voters list. The only difference is that the challenge to the substitution of his name before the then District Co-operative Election Authority, was turned down by him, whereas in the present case the Respondent no. 1 himself has refused to substitute the name of Petitioner no. 1.

21. On perusal of Rule 10(4) of the Rules of 2014, among the various eventualities provided in the said Rule, resignation by the representative is one of eventualities. This eventuality of resignation by the representative is not further qualified by providing that the representative should resign as a member of the Society and only case of such resignation of membership it is permissible to substitute the name. This provision does not make a distinction between the resignation

as a delegate and a resignation as a member. The Respondent no. 1 by interpreting the aforementioned provision has overstepped his jurisdiction. It is not within the powers of respondent no. 1, to interpret provisions of law. He has to act strictly in accordance with the provisions of law as provided in the statute books while conducting the Elections.

Even though, this Court as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court has issued a word of caution about causing interference interfere in the elections, once the election programme is declared. However, while doing so it is also held that, in exceptional cases, such interference is necessary, where there is a patent error of law by applying non-existent Rules or where a binding provision are ignored.

After taking into consideration various decision of this Court as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court on the issue of causing interference in the voters' list, availability of alternate remedy; and interference by the Court in the election process, A Division Bench of this Court in **Dattatray Genaba Lole and Others** (Supra), has made following observations:

> *"8.4 The only circumstance in which the Courts would be inclined to interfere in a challenge to an election process at an intermediate stage would be when the order or action under challenge is patently and demonstrably illegal, such as, for example, by applying a non- existent rule or provision to the election process or failing to adhere to a mandatory provision. The intervention in such cases has been explained as enabling or assisting the process of the election rather than thwarting or stalling it. Also, one of the important aspects to consider is the precise stage of the election process and the delay, if any, in the filing of the petition."*

22. In another decision of this Court about permissibility of interference in the election process this court in the case of **Ankushbhau Juglal Bhaghele Versus State of Maharashtra and others, reported in 2022 (4) Mh.L.J. 539,** has made following observations, which is reproduced here under :

> *"7. The illegality is not of minor or technical nature and the writ Court cannot turn a blind eye and be a mute spectator on the jurisprudential logic that the election process has commenced and the writ Court ought to be loathe to interfere. The 'Laxman Rekha' as I have observed supra, can be crossed, as long as the writ Court treads cautiously and with extreme circumspection."*

Thus, there are decisions where this Court has made exception to the general rule that, the Courts should not interfere in the matters of Election, once the election process has commenced. It is held that in cases where there is a patent illegality or non-adherence to the Rules of election, interference by Courts is necessary, Courts cannot be silent spectator and allow such illegality to perpetuate, in case it is brought to the notice of the Court.

23. This Court had an occasion to consider the permissibility and legality of substitution of representative of a Society, as provided in Rule 10 (4) of the Election Rules of 2014, and strict adherence to the time frame prescribed under the said sub-Rule in case of **Sangali Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd. (supra).** While deciding the aforementioned issue this Court has made following observation :

> *"9. In so far as rule 10(4) of the said Rules is concerned, as indicated above, it is in two eventualities that the change in delegate is permitted i.e. the death of the representative or a newly elected committee comes into being. The said rule postulates the time frame within which the application is to be made. The underlying principle of the said rule is therefore to see to it that the member society*

does not go unrepresented. Hence in case of the death of the representative, there can be a change in the delegate as also when a newly elected committee takes office, the underlying principle behind the second circumstance seems to be that the management of the member society nominates a delegate of its choice. The time frame that is stipulated in the said rule has to be considered in the said context. If the time frame is to be construed strictly and there is no flexibility in it then it may happen that the society may go unrepresented in the case of death if the change is not sought within the time stipulated in rule 10(4) or in the event the newly committee comes into being and the request is not sought within the time frame, the member society may then be foisted or saddled with a delegate who is not of its choice and in respect of whom it does not have confidence. Hence a purposive interpretation would have to be given to the said rule. In my view, therefore in the facts of the instant case, which can be said to be peculiar in nature on account of the fact that the results of the elections of the Petitioner Bank were declared on the last date of filing of the nominations, for the Respondent No.3 federation, the said rule 10(4) of the Rules in so far as the time period mentioned therein cannot be strictly applied. Ultimately the endeavour is always to see that the change of the representative or delegate is in keeping with the democratic principles and that on technicalities it should not happen that the democratic process is thwarted. There can be no gainsaying of the fact that the Respondent No.4 herein is not a person of the choice of the present Board of Directors of the Petitioner Bank which has been elected on 12/5/2015. He is no more the Director of the Petitioner Bank

> *having lost in the elections and therefore also not entitled to represent the Petitioner Bank. Hence the possibility of a constant acrimony between the Board of Directors and the Respondent No.4 cannot be ruled out. The Respondent No.4 also would not be in position to put across the view point of the Board of Directors of the Petitioner Bank as he has failed to get elected in the elections which took place on 12/5/2015 and is therefore not a part of the Board of the Petitioner Bank For the aforesaid reasons and in the peculiar facts of the present case, the strict application of rule 10(4) in so far as the time frame is concerned, is not warranted. Hence in appropriate cases the delegate can be allowed to be changed and the time frame mentioned in the said rule 10(4) cannot be construed as a fetter to permit such change."*

24. The above observations are made by this court, when Rule 10 (4) of the Rules of 2014, provided only two eventualities for substitution of the representative, in case of death of representative or newly elected committee coming into being. This Court has taken a view that although the Rule postulates time frame within which application is to be made, the object behind such Rule is required to be appreciated. The object being that a member Society does not go unrepresented and the member Society nominates the delegates of its choice. It is held that, if the said Rule is applied rigidly, the Society would

remain unrepresented. This Court has therefore, observed that Rule 10 (4) in so far the time line given in the said Rule is concerned cannot be applied rigidly, strict application of this Rule is not warranted. The technicalities should not result in halting the democratic process of elections. In appropriate cases delegate can be allowed to be changed and the time frame mentioned cannot be considered as a fetter to permit such change.

25. If we consider the present case in the light of the observations made in the decisions referred supra, a valid resolution accepting the resignation of Smt. Rama Pravin Gujrathi and nominating Petitioner no. 1 has been passed on 05.10.2026, it was already forwarded to Respondent no. 1 on 05.10.2026, itself by Respondent no. 3. Thus, the petitioner have taken necessary steps to effect change in the name of representative well within the time prescribed. However the order impugned has been passed by Respondent no. 1 after eight days of receiving such resolution. Thus, Respondent no.1 has also failed to take appropriate decision ensuring the compliance of the time line which is binding on the Petitioners

as well as Respondents equally.

26. In this regard, it would be profitable to refer the observations made by the Co-ordinate bench in the case of **Murlidhar Rangrao Gaikwad Versus State Co-operative Election Authority**, in Writ Petition no. 4072 of 2025, which is reproduced herein under, which reads thus :

> *"74. In the light of the above pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Deoraj (supra), and the principles laid down in Pandurang Hindurao Patil (supra), Chandrakant Mahadev Patole (supra), Ahmednagar Zilla(supra), Ashok Kumar (supra), and Pundlik(supra), the legal position that emerges is that in election matters governed by the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960, where the Court is satisfied that the impugned action of the Returning Officer -- whether in acceptance or rejection of a nomination paper -- is ex facie illegal, patently erroneous, or vitiated by a jurisdictional infirmity, the High Court would be justified in invoking its extraordinary writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution. Such interference is permissible even at an intermediate stage of the election process, so long as it does not require postponement or disruption of any stage of the election. The object of judicial intervention in such cases is not to interfere with the democratic process, but to uphold its sanctity by preventing grave illegality that may otherwise vitiate the entire election and render post-election remedies illusory. This principle is in consonance with the well-established legal proposition that the right to contest an election*

> *must be exercised in accordance with law, and any action by the Returning Officer that violates statutory requirements -- such as failure to consider material disqualification or non-compliance with mandatory provisions of the Rules or Bye-laws -- is amenable to judicial scrutiny at the pre- election stage."*

In the instant case immediately after, passing of the order by Respondent no. 1, the Petitioners have approached this Court by filing this Writ Petition on 17.10.2026, which was heard by this Court 21.10.2026. Thus, there is no delay as such on the part of the Petitioners in diligently taking steps for substituting the name of Smt. Rama Gujrathi and raising challenge to the impugned order.

27. So far as the objection to the change in the voters' list in view of the declaration of the election programme is concerned, Rule 10 (4) itself permits making such change by way of substitution in the voters' list not later than five days prior to the last date for making nominations. In the instant case, the last of date of filing nominations is 30.10.2026. Five days prior to the last day was 25.10.2026,which was a Sunday and, immediately thereafter, today when the matter is listed and

heard which is virtually fifth day prior to last day of nomination. Thus, in my view if such substitution, which is permissible as per Rule 10(4) of the Rules of 2014, is not allowed Petitioner no. 2 – Society would go unrepresented in the upcoming elections of the Jalgaon District Central Co-operative Bank, who would be against the spirit of democratic process of elections. More particularly when the Petitioners have promptly taken appropriate steps well within the time frame by forwarding the resolution to the Respondent no. 1, who has taken almost 8 days, for passing the Impugned order, by overstepping his jurisdiction. The Respondent no.1 while passing the order has interpreted, something that is not provided in the Statute, which amounts to arbitrary exercise of powers, thereby depriving Petitioner no. 2 – to participate in the election of the Jalgaon District Central Co-operative Bank. As a result of setting aside the impugned order, it is not likely to cause any disruption in the election programme, that has already commenced, since the only change that would be made is substitution of the representative of Petitioner no. 2 in the voters' list. Hence, I pass the following order :

ORDER

i. The Writ Petition is allowed.

ii. The Order passed by Respondent no. 1 – district Co-operative Election Authority, dated 13.10.2026, is set aside.

iii. Respondent no. 1 is directed to include name of Petitioner no.1 Ghanshyma Onkarlal Agrawal, as a delegate of Petitioner no. 2 – Chopda Vividh Karyakari Seva Society Limited, in the final voters' list of Jalgaon District Cooperative Bank Limited to represent Petitioner no. 2 – Society.

iv. The Learned Advocate appearing for Respondent no. 1 shall communicate the order passed by this Court to the Authority immediately.

v. Civil Applications stand disposed of.

vi. Rule is made absolute in the above terms.

(MANJUSHA A. DESHPANDE, J.)

SPC