



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 7394 OF 2024

KESHARBAI BALASAHEB SONNER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH
THE SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Adv. Nikita Kirjawalkekar h/f.
Mr. Dnyaneshwar B. Pokale
AGP for Respondents: Ms. Chaitali Chaudhari Kutti
Advocate for Respondent No.6 : Mr. K.J. Suryawanshi
...

CORAM : ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, J.

DATE : 20.02.2026

PER COURT:

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned AGP for the state authorities and learned counsel appearing for the contesting respondents.
2. By the present Writ Petition, the petitioner takes an exception to the order dated 29.05.2024 passed by respondent No.2- Registrar General of Mondeylenders and Additional Commissioner and Special Registrar, Co-operative Society, Maharashtra State, Pune by which the respondent No.2 has disposed of the revision filed by the

petitioner under Section 9 of the Maharashtra Money Lending (Regulation) Act, 2014 (for short ‘the Act of 2014’) on the ground that the revision filed by the petitioner is not maintainable by virtue of order dated 24.04.2024 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 14389 of 2019 alongwith Writ Petition No. 14387 of 2019 and Writ Petition No. 254 of 2020 wherein, this Court had held that the revision under Section 9 is not maintainable in view of finality attained to the order passed under Section 18 (4) of the Act of 2014.

3. However, it is pertinent to note that the order dated 24.04.2024 (supra), was subject matter of review in Review Application No. 196 of 2024 wherein, this Court by an order dated 12.09.2024 has revived the earlier order relying on the orders passed by this Court by observing in paragraphs Nos. 4 to 8 which reads thus :

“4. This Court (Coram: Rohit B. Deo, J.) at Nagpur Bench, in the judgment of **Vishwanath Marotrao Ganjre vs. Divisional Joint Registrar Co-operative Society, Amravati and others, Writ Petition No.5362 of 2017**, dated 28.08.2018, in paragraph Nos.7 and 8 observed that;

“7. The phraseology of section 9 of the Act would indicate that the intention of the legislature is to make available the revisional remedy as a matter of right. The use of expression “suo-motu” and “on an application” would indicate the legislative intent”.

8. Considering the facts of the case, the revisional remedy is an alternate and equally efficacious remedy. No case is made out for this Court to exercise writ jurisdiction.

5. Thereafter, in view of the above judgment, the revision petitions were filed before the Registrar General of Money Lending.

6. After the judgment of **Vishwanth Marotrao Ganjre** (supra), the view was consistent that against the judgment in appeal under Section 18(1) and (2) against the order of the Divisional Joint Registrar, the revision lies to the Registrar General Money Lending.

7. Since the view is consistent, the normal rule is, the Court should respect the view of the co-ordinate Bench, unless there are contradicting judgments.

8. In view thereof, this Court is of the view that the review application is liable to be allowed and the impugned order of this Court dismissing the petition on the ground that the Registrar General Money Lending has no jurisdiction of revision under Section 9 of Maharashtra Money Lending (Regulation) Act, 2014, is reviewed.”

4. In that view of the matter, since this Court has held that the revision under Section 9 of the Act of 2014 challenging the order passed under Section 18 (4) of the Act of 2014 is maintainable, the impugned order dated 29.05.2024 passed by respondent No.2 holding that the revision under Section 9 of the Act of 2014 is not maintainable is liable to be quashed and set-aside.

5. By virtue of setting aside the order dated 29.05.2024 passed by the respondent No.2, the revision filed by the petitioner stands

restored to its original position for being decided in accordance with law and on its own merits.

6. The contesting parties undertake to appear before the respondent No.2 on 13.03.2026 at 11:00 am.

7. Since, the parties have agreed to appear before the respondent No.2, no separate notices are required to be issued to them.

8. In peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the respondent No.2 shall decide the revision filed by the petitioner as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of three months from the date on which the petitioner and respondent No. 6 will appear before him.

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

(ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, J.)

vsj..