



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

**WRIT PETITION NO. 10713 OF 2024**

Shri Sidhshwar Macchavyavsay Sahakari Sanstha Ltd  
Through Its Chairman

**VERSUS**

The Deuputy Registrar Co Operative Societies And Others

...

Mr. K. J. Suryawanshi, Advocate for the Petitioner

Mrs. M. L. Sangit, AGP for Respondent-State

Mr. N. D. Sonavane, Advocate for Respondent nos.3 to 23

.....

**CORAM : AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, J.**

**DATED : 25<sup>TH</sup> MARCH, 2026**

**ORDER :-**

1. Vide order dated 04.04.2024, the Assistant Registrar, Co-operative Societies (Dairy), Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar condoned the delay in an appeal sought to be filed under Section 23(2) of the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960. The proceedings were filed at the behest of the respondent nos.3 to 23.

2. The petitioner feeling aggrieved by the condonation of delay, preferred Revision Application before the Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Societies (Fishery) Mumbai under Section 154 of the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960. He would submit that there was a short delay in filing the Revision Application.

3. Mr. K. J. Suryawanshi, learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that without giving any notice of hearing in

the Revision Application, either to the petitioner or even to the respondents, the Deputy Registrar Co-operative Societies (Fishery), State of Maharashtra, Mumbai issued a letter addressed to the petitioner.

4. The letter dated 07.08.2024 is as much vague as one could be. The communication is in the sense 'meaningless'. It seems that the said authority has conveyed that after passing of condonation of delay, there is no order passed in the main appeal under Section 23(2) of the Act, and hence no order in the Revision Application could be passed. Rendering such observation, it seems that the said authority has merely closed down the Revision proceedings.

5. Feeling aggrieved by the said order dated 07.08.2024 as also the order dated 04.04.2024 the petitioner is before this Court.

6. Mr. N. D. Sonavane, learned Counsel for respondents, Mrs. M. L. Sangit, learned AGP as also Mr. K. J. Suryawanshi, learned Counsel for the petitioner submit that the hearing in the appeal under Section 23(2) has now been concluded and the matter is kept for orders in the petition.

7. In view of this, no purpose would be served in directing the authorities to reopen the Revision Petition filed by the petitioner. However, this Court is constrained to observe that the authorities i.e. Deputy Director, Co-operative Societies (Fishery) must follow some discipline and modality while dealing with the Revision Petitions and the applications filed before them by the parties under the provisions of law.

8. In any case, it was incumbent on the part of the authorities to give notice to the parties for hearing and then pass appropriate orders in accordance with law. The reasons recorded by the Deputy Registrar that since the main appeal under Section 23(2) is pending the Revision Petition could not be heard, is not justified at all.

9. This Court expects that the authorities shall henceforth follow the principles of natural justice and act with due promptness while dealing with the appeals and Revisions filed under the provisions of law. In view of the above, the Writ Petition stands disposed of.

10. Both the learned Counsel submit that they have already argued the matter before the authorities and have also filed written notes of arguments. It is expected from the concerned authority that the authority shall pass an appropriate order on merits within a period of three months from today.

( AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, J. )