

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 4796 OF 2026

Bank of Maharashtra Throu. POA .. Petitioner  
Sanjeev Varma

V/S.

State of Maharashtra Throu. Govt .. Respondents  
Pleader and Ors

-----  
Mr. Sanjay Anabhawane, i/b Ms. Medha Rane, for the Petitioner.

Ms. Tanu N. Bhatia, AGP for Respondent No. 1 – State.

Mr. S. R. Nargolkar (through VC), for Respondent No. 2.

Mr. Hrishikesh S. Shinde, for Respondent Nos. 5 and 6.

-----  
CORAM : MANISH PITALE &  
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ.

DATE : 22ND APRIL 2026.

PC:

1. A praecipe is moved for speaking to the minutes in respect of the orders dated 17/04/2026, passed in Writ Petition Nos. 4795 of 2026 and 4796 of 2026.

2. It is brought to our notice that due to inadvertence, learned counsel appearing through video conferencing on the said date appeared for the respondent borrowers in Writ Petition No. 4795 of 2026, which was at Serial No. 13, instead of Writ Petition No. 4796 of 2026, which was listed at Serial No. 14. It is submitted that this Court may consider correcting the error in appearance and the recording of submissions on behalf of respondents

borrowers in the said petitions.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner bank (secured creditor) confirms that an error has occurred in the orders.

4. In view of the above, appearance of learned counsel shown for Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 in Writ Petition No. 4795 of 2026, shall be deleted and paragraphs 4 and 5 shall also be deleted from the said order. As a consequence, the subsequent paragraphs of the said order shall stand re-numbered.

5. Appearance of counsel Mr. Hrishikesh S. Shinde along with Mr. Anish Deshpande, shall now be shown in order dated 17/04/2026, passed in Writ Petition 4796 of 2026 for Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 (borrowers). In the said order, paragraphs 7 and 8 shall be added as follows:

“4. Respondent Nos. 5 to 6, being the original borrowers, are represented by a counsel, who has joined the proceedings through video-conferencing. He is seeking adjournment in order to assist this Court.

5. We are of the opinion that the scope of the present writ petition is concerned with appropriate directions to be issued to the respondent State authorities to ensure that the rule of law is followed. The learned counsel for respondent Nos. 5 to 6 could not even dispute the fact that they trespassed into the property and hence, no adjournment can be granted on their request.”

6. Consequently, the subsequent paragraphs of the said order shall be changed accordingly.

7. The corrections in the aforesaid orders shall be carried out and the corrected orders shall be uploaded on the website.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)