



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.1190 OF 2026

Suresh S/O Mahadeorao Mankar And Others

Vs.

State Of Maharashtra, Thr. Secretary, Dept. Of Cooperation, Mumbai And
Others

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders
---	---------------------------

Mr. Raheel Mirza, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Ms. K.H. Bhondge, AGP for the Respondent Nos.1 to 4/State.

Mr. V.B. Bhise, Advocate for Respondent No.5.

CORAM: PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.

DATED : 18th MARCH, 2026

1. Heard learned counsel for petitioners as well as learned counsels for respondents.
2. On 09.02.2026, this Court has passed the following Order :-

“ Heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

2. The petitioners' challenge is to the interim order dated 29.01.2026 passed by respondent No.2 Divisional Registrar (Money Lending), Amravati, in the proceedings under Section 18 (4) of the Maharashtra Money Lending (Regulation) Act, 2014, on the ground that the proceedings are initiated after a period of about 17 years from the date of the first sale-deed dated 09.06.2003. He also submits that after this sale-deed, three other sale-deeds were executed, and, without considering all these aspects, the impugned order is passed refusing any interim relief.

3. Having regard to the controversy involved, issue notice to the respondents, returnable after three weeks.

4. Learned AGP waives service of notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 4/State.

5. In the meantime, the parties are directed to maintain the status quo as regards the mutation of suit property”

3. While considering the controversy, it is seen that the challenge is to an interim order passed by respondent No.2 and the proceedings of Appeal under Section 18(4) of the Maharashtra Money Lending (Regulation) Act, 2014 are going on. As such, the controversy on merits will be decided while deciding the appeal and hence, it is desirable that the appeal is permitted to be adjudicated on merits, while directing the parties to maintain status-quo.

4. Learned counsel for petitioners as well as learned counsel for respondents also submitted that the parties are ready to maintain the above mentioned status-quo as regards the mutation of the suit property during the pendency of the appeal before respondent No.2, however, they seek a direction to expedite the decision of the appeal.

5. Having regard to the controversy involved, the writ petition is **disposed of** with a direction to the respondent No.2 to decide the appeal expeditiously, preferably within the period of six months.

6. In the meantime, parties are directed to maintain status-quo as per the above mentioned order. All issues on merits are kept open.

(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.)

Privel