

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 920 OF 2026

Laxmi Vikas Sonawane

....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Anr.

....Respondents

Mr. Shivshankar D. Patil, for the Petitioner.

Mr. P. P. Kakade, Addl. GP. a/w. Ms. P. N. Diwan, AGP for the State.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.**

DATE : 7th MARCH, 2026

P.C. :-

1. We have heard the learned Advocate for the Petitioner. The learned Advocate, Mr. Shenoy, who had assisted us on 4th March 2026, submits that he has communicated the pendency of this proceeding to the RBI. He further submits that he has no instructions to appear in the matter.

2. From the pleadings in the Petition, we find that there are two Fixed Deposit Receipts drawn with Respondent No. 2, Pune Urban Co-operative Bank Limited, Pune.

3. The first applicant in both the FDRs is, Bhagwan

Khashaba Sonawane. The joint applicant is Vikas Khashaba Sonawane. The present Petitioner, Laxmi Vikas Sonawane, claims to be the legally wedded wife of Vikas Khashaba Sonawane, who has passed away.

4. The issue pertains to two Fixed Deposit Receipts (FDRs). In one FDR, the Petitioner, Laxmi Vikas Sonawane, is shown as the nominee, being the wife of the depositor. In the second FDR, wherein the first applicant is again Bhagwan Khashaba Sonawane and the joint applicant is Vikas Bhagwan Sonawane, the nomination form indicates the depositor as Bhagwan Khashaba Sonawane and Laxmi is shown as the nominee, being the wife. Prima facie, it appears that the name of the first Applicant may have been mentioned instead of the name of the joint applicant, with whom the Petitioner claims to have a husband–wife relationship. In another FD form placed on record, Vikas Bhagwan Sonawane is the sole Applicant and has mentioned the name of the nominee as Dhanashree Vikas Sonawane. However, the relationship of the nominee is not mentioned in the form.

5. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner, Laxmi,

submits that this FDR, after maturity, was closed by the Bank and the proceeds were delivered to the present Petitioner, who claims that she, Laxmi, is the same person as Dhanashree. However, in the Heirship Certificate proceedings, there is no conclusion recorded by the Trial Court that Laxmi Vikas Sonawane is the same person as Dhanashree Vikas Sonawane.

6. The record also reveals that after the husband of the Petitioner, namely Vikas Sonawane, passed away on 12.04.2021, the Petitioner changed her name from Dhanashree to Laxmi.

7. We find several disputed issues before us, primarily with regard to whether the present Petitioner, Laxmi, is the same lady by name Dhanashree, or whether Dhanashree, claiming to be the wife of Vikas, got her name changed after the demise of Vikas and became Laxmi. It is further noted that the Respondent No. 2 Bank has delivered the proceeds of one FDR, upon its maturity, to Dhanashree. The two other FDRs have matured, in which the nominee is shown as Laxmi. Bhagwan Khashaba Sonawane, whom the Petitioner claims to be her father-in-law, is still alive.

8. Considering the above, we do not wish to entertain this Petition, though we have spent considerable time examining whether we could assist the present Petitioner while exercising our Writ Jurisdiction. However, the reply of Respondent No. 2 Pune Urban Co-operative Bank Limited, addressed to the Reserve Bank of India, dated 11.11.2021, indicates that a dispute is pending before the Civil Court and that the FDRs drawn by Bhagwan Khashaba Sonawane, who is an agriculturist, are sub-judice. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner informs us that the said suit is for partition and separate possession in relation to the ancestral property.

9. Considering the above, it would be appropriate for the Petitioner to seek a Succession Certificate. We record that if such an application is filed, the Petitioner shall disclose this order by placing it before the said Court through her pleadings, as well as by way of an annexure to the documents annexed to the application.

10. Suppression of this order in the Succession Certificate proceedings would be considered a deliberate, wilful and intentional act. Needless to state, the concerned Court dealing with the

Succession Certificate application shall ensure that an advertisement is published in a widely circulated newspaper, when objections are called for.

11. As such, **this Petition is disposed off.**

12. Considering the territorial jurisdiction, we direct the learned Registrar General of this Court to communicate this order to the learned Principal District Judge, Pune, for circulation to all Courts falling within the Judicial District of Pune, which have jurisdiction to deal with applications seeking a Succession Certificate.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)