



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 5488 OF 2026

**PRIMARY AGRICULTURAL CREDIT COOP SOCIETY LTD
PATHARI AND ANOTHER**

VERSUS

**STATE COOPERATIVE ELECTION AUTHORITY PUNE
THROUGH ITS COMMISSIONER AND OTHERS**

...

Mr. Nilkanth R. Pawade, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Mr. V. H. Dighe, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.
Mr. S. S. Gangakhedkar, Advocate for Respondent No.3.
Mr. K. J. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent No.4.

...

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5489 OF 2026**

**PRIMARY AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CO OP SOCIETY LTD
PATHARI AND ANOTHER**

VERSUS

**STATE COOPERATIVE ELECTION AUTHORITY PUNE
THROUGH ITS COMMISSIONER AND OTHERS**

...

Mr. Nilkanth R. Pawade, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Mr. V. H. Dighe, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.
Mr. S. S. Gangakhedkar, Advocate for Respondent No.3.
Mr. K. J. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent No.4.

...

**CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.
DATED : 11th JUNE, 2026.**

P.C.:-

1. The petitioner impugns order dated 28.05.2026 passed by respondent no.2-District Election Officer and Divisional Joint Registrar, Co-operative Society, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, thereby allowing objections of respondent no.4 to the nomination of petitioner no.2 as delegate/representative of Society of respondent no.3-PDCC Bank.

2. It is contention of petitioners that petitioner no.1-Society had passed Resolution dated 16.04.2026, thereby nominating petitioner no.2 as delegate/representative of petitioner no.1-Society at election of PDCC Bank. In pursuance to said Resolution, name of petitioner no.2 was appearing in provisional voters list as delegate/representative of Society. However, respondent no.4 raised objection challenging inclusion of name of petitioner no.2 contending that there is no valid Resolution.

3. It is not disputed before this Court that Resolution dated 16.04.2026 was passed in presence of 6 Directors of Society. Admittedly, said Resolution is passed in absence of majority. The bye-laws of Society specifies that a Resolution passed without majority can be ratified in subsequent meeting. Admittedly, in present case, no such meeting is held. Therefore, on the basis of Resolution dated 16.04.2026, which is not ratified in terms of bye-laws, name of petitioner no.2 cannot be included. The Election Officer appears to have applied legal position in consonance with bye-laws. Hence, no fault can be found in impugned order.

4. In result, Writ Petitions stand dismissed.

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR)
JUDGE