



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

WRIT PETITION NO.2084 OF 2026

SBI SBO Ganesh Kripa CHS Ltd.

....Petitioner

V/S

Divisional Joint Registrar

Co-operative Societies & Anr.

....Respondents

Mr. Sandesh Deshpande *for the Petitioner.*

Ms. P.J. Gavhane, AGP *for Respondent Nos.1 and 2/State.*

Mr. Champaklal Chheda- *Respondent No.3 in-person through his daughter
Ms. Sheetal Champaklal Chheda.*

CORAM : SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.

DATE : 15 JUNE 2026.

P.C.:

1. The limited challenge in the present Petition is to the order dated 15 April 2025 passed by the Divisional Joint Registrar by which parties are directed to maintain *status-quo*. Before the Divisional Joint Registrar, Respondent No.3 has challenged the NOC granted by the Deputy Registrar for carrying out redevelopment in accordance with the guidelines issued by the State Government under Section 79A of the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960 (**MCS Act**).

2. I have heard Mr. Deshpande, the learned counsel appearing for Petitioner and Mr. Champaklal Chheda - Respondent No.3 appears in-

person. He however submits that since he is unwell, he be permitted to be represented by his daughter Ms. Sheetal Champaklal Chheda. Accordingly, I have heard Ms. Sheetal Chheda on behalf of Respondent No.3.

3. It appears that this Court has already stayed the impugned order dated 15 April 2025 by passing order dated 16 February 2026 which reads thus:

“1. The Deputy Registrar, by order dated 26 February 2024, granted a No Objection for redevelopment in accordance with the guidelines issued by the State Government under Section 79A of the Maharashtra Cooperative Societies Act, 1960. The said order appears to have been challenged by respondent No. 3 by filing Revision Application No. 10 of 2025, wherein the Revisional Authority has granted an order of status quo.

2. Prima facie, in the context of the order passed by the Deputy Registrar granting No Objection, the expression “status quo” appears to have no meaningful application. Ordinarily, an order of status quo is understood in the light of the prayer or relief sought by the party concerned. However, when the order granting No Objection is ex facie without jurisdiction, a direction to maintain status quo does not carry any legal significance.

3. Hence, issue notice to Respondent No. 3 for final disposal, returnable on 9 March 2026.

4. Until further orders the order dated 15 April 2025 shall remain stayed.”

4. The Revision filed by the Respondent No.3 is still pending before the Divisional Joint Registrar. In that view of the matter, the Divisional Joint Registrar can be requested to expedite hearing of the Revision Application filed by Respondent No.3. The *status quo* order granted by Divisional Joint Registrar has already been stayed since 16 February 2026. That stay would continue during pendency of the Revision Application.

5. The Petition is accordingly disposed of by directing the Divisional Joint Registrar to decide the pending Revision in an expeditious manner preferably within a period of three months. Parties shall appear before the Divisional Joint Registrar alongwith a copy of this order on 24 June 2026 and seek further directions for fixation of dates of hearing in the Revision.
6. All rights and contentions of the parties on merits are expressly kept open.
7. It is clarified that the *status quo* order dated 15 April 2025 is not operational by virtue of order dated 16 February 2026, which position shall continue during pendency of the Revision Application.
8. With the above directions, the Writ Petition is **disposed of**. There shall be no order as to costs.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)