IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 4930 OF 2026

Jayashri Annasaheb Khot ……Petitioner
Vs.
The State Of Maharashtra,
Through The Secretary Dept. Of Co-operation
And Textile & Ors. ……Respondents

...

Mr. D. V. Sutar, with Ms. Reshma J Adnaik and Mr. Ketan Patil, Advocate for Petitioner.
Mr. Sanjay D. Rayrikar, AGP for Respondent-State.

...

CORAM : SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.
DATE : 5TH OCTOBER, 2026.

ORDER :

. Heard Mr. D. V. Sutar, learned advocate for the Petitioner.

2. The Petitioner is questioning the order dated 11.08.2023 passed by the learned Minister, allowing the revision and quashing the orders passed by the Assistant Registrar and the Divisional Joint Registrar.

3. The Petitioner is a member of Respondent No. 4-Society, from whom he solicited information. The Application was allowed by the Assistant Registrar. Being aggrieved thereby, a revision was preferred

before the Divisional Joint Registrar, which was dismissed. Against that order, the Respondent-Society preferred a revision before the learned Minister, which was allowed by the impugned order.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the information/documents which are withheld are squarely covered by Section 32. It is submitted that the Petitioner is an investor and the Respondent-Society entered into transactions involving investments of the Petitioner and others. In this manner, the transaction can be said to be impliedly between the Petitioner and the Society.

5. The error of jurisdiction is stated to have been committed in the impugned order. The Petitioner is a member of Respondent No. 4-Society, who had solicited various documents, which were allowed by the authorities below. The learned Minister, by the impugned order, also endorses that she is entitled to receive the documents, but not in respect of vouchers and expenditure bills from January 2018 to March 2023, which would fall outside the purview of Section 32 of the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960.

5. The member who is the information seeker is entitled to have inspection of, or obtain, documents in respect of the transactions

entered into with the Society. The claim of the Petitioner that the Society entered into transactions with third parties and that, being an investor, she is entitled to have vouchers or expenditure bills is far-fetched. The view taken by the learned Minister cannot be faulted. There is no record to show that the documents solicited are in respect of any direct transaction between the Petitioner and Respondent No. 4-Society. It would always be open for the parties to solicit documents as is permissible in law, especially under the Right to Information Act, 2005.

6. I find that the view taken by the learned Minister is a possible view and needs no interference. The Writ Petition is **dismissed**. However, it is clarified that the Petitioner will have the liberty to take recourse to the Right to Information Act for soliciting information as is permissible in law.

[SHAILESH P. BRAHME J.]

Suresh