

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

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. 5912 OF 2026

Padma Dawda

...Petitioner

Vs.

The Tahsildar and Executive
Magistrate, Khalapur
and Ors.

...Respondents

M. Ramesh alongwith Acharya Vijay Anand - Advocate for the
Petitioner

Smt. G. R. Raghuwanshi – AGP for the Respondent-State

**CORAM : M. S. KARNIK AND
 S. M. MODAK, JJ.**

DATE : 06th MAY 2026

P. C. :-

1. The cheque has been issued by Tahsildar in the name of the
Petitioner-Padma Dawda. However, there is cheque return memo as
'name differs on advice'. It is submitted by learned counsel for the
Petitioner that the cheque was deposited in the joint account of the
Petitioner as well as her mother. If that is so, there was no reason for
return the cheque as the account was in the joint name of the Petitioner
and her mother Tulsi Venkat Raju.

2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that an appropriate application will be made to the Tahsildar for some alternate arrangement so that the amount of the cheque either can be encashed in the account of the Petitioner or the same could be deposited with National Consumer Dispute Redressal Forum, where the Petitioner owes some money.

3. It is for the Petitioner to make an appropriate application to the Tahsildar. If such an application is made, the Tahsildar to consider the same on merits. However, it needs to be ensured that the amount of Rs. 1,95,69,700/- (In words - One Crore Ninety Five Lakh Sixty Nine Thousand Seven Hundred Rupees) should be paid to the Petitioner either by cheque or in any other mode and/or the same should be credited to the account of the Petitioner. Necessary steps be taken by the Tahsildar.

4. In such view of the matter, the learned counsel for the Petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the Writ Petition.

5. The Writ petition is disposed of as withdrawn.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)