



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 6502 OF 2025

**YOGIRAJ VISHWANATH MULE AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH
ITS SECRETARY AND OTHERS**

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Thorat R. D.
AGP for Respondents: Mr. S.P. Sonpawale

...

CORAM : ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, J.

DATE : 20.02.2026

PER COURT:

1. Heard.
2. By this Writ Petition, the petitioners have put forth the following reliefs :

“A This writ petition may kindly be allowed.

B) Kindly be quashed and set aside order thdtd 27/09/2023, 24/08/2023 and 22/12/2022-737 passed by respondent No.2 to 4 in complaint no.5761/2022 and further direct conduct inquiry on application dtd.19/12/2022 and passed fresh order as per the provision of law.

C) Kindly be declared and hold that respondents authority has a no power to dismissed or reject application as well as Revision Petition without following the procedure therefore order passed by authority without following procedure liable to be quashed and set aside.”

3. It seems that the petitioners have filed a complaint under Section 18(2) of the The Maharashtra Money-Lending (Regulation)

Act, 2014 (for short 'the Act of 2014') before the respondent No.4/District Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Beed. It appears that respondent No.4 by an order dated 22/26.12.2022 disposed of the said complaint on the ground that the same has been filed beyond the prescribed period of limitation. It seems that an appeal filed by the petitioners under Section 18 (4) of the Act of 2014, came to be disposed of on the ground of delay by an order dated 24.08.2023 passed by the respondent No.2.

4. It seems that the petitioners again approached the respondent No.2 by filing appeal alongwith the application seeking condonation of delay. However, by impugned order dated 27.09.2023, the respondent No.2 has disposed of the said proceedings holding that the proceedings cannot be entertained under Section 18 (4) of the Act of 2014 as the complaint filed by the petitioners have been disposed of by the respondent No.4 not on merits but on the ground of delay.

5. The impugned order however, depicts that the respondent No.2 has granted liberty to the petitioners to file a Revision under Section 9 of the Act of 2014.

6. In that view of the matter, I find that since, the respondent No.2 has already granted liberty to the petitioners to file a Revision

under Section 9 of the Act of 2014, I do not find any reason to interfere with the impugned order.

7. Needless to state that the petitioners may file revision under Section 9 of the Act of 2014, thereby challenging the order dated 22/26.12.2022 passed by respondent No.4/District Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Beed by which the complaint filed by the petitioners has been disposed of on the ground of delay.

8. If the petitioners file a revision under Section 9 of the Act of 2014 challenging the aforesaid order passed by respondent No.4 within a period of one month from today, the respondent No.2 shall decide the said revision on its own merits and in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of filing of revision by the petitioners. Needless to state that, time spent in prosecuting this Writ Petition shall be considered while considering the aspect of delay.

9. With these directions, the Writ Petition stands disposed of.

(ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, J.)