



MHCO100001412021 	Presented on	: 26/08/2021
	Registered on	: 26/08/2021
	Decided on	: 30/03/2026
	Duration : 04Yrs. 07Ms. 05Ds.	

IN THE COURT OF JUDGE CO-OPERATIVE COURT NO.1 AT SANGLI

(Presided over by Smt. S. V. Jadhav)

C.C. No: 137/2021
Exh. 97




Up Pradeshik Parivahan Adhikari Karyalayin
Sewakanchi Sahkari Patsanstha Marya, Sangli
Through Secretary Shri. Jagannath Rau Patil.
Age – 70, Occu.- Service,
R/o. Plot No. 193, Ghanshyamnagar, Sangli.
Mo. No. 9763759995.

... Disputant

Versus

1. Late Namdeo Gurbasu Kadam (Legal Heirs)
 - 1A. Smt. Sandhyarani Namdeo Kadam.
Age – 55, Occu.- Housework,
 - 1B. Swapnil Namdeo Kadam.
Age – 29, Occu.- Service,
 - 1C. Shubham Namdeo Kadam.
Age – 27, Occu.- Education,
 - 1D. Kum. Komal Namdeo Kadam.
Age – 24, Occu.- Service,
All R/o. Mangesh Apartment, Sangram Chowk,
Gaonbhag, Sangli.
2. Shri. Vasant Ramchandra More
Age – 60, Occu.- Retired,
R/o. Near Vasantdada Kusti Kendra, Yashwantnagar,
Sangli
3. Shri. Amar Nivrutti Mahekar
Age – 46, Occu.- Service,
R/o. Through Up Pradeshik Parivahan Karyalay,
Aoudyogik Vasahat, Madhavnagar Rd, Sangli.

... Opponents


30/3/2026

4. Up Pradeshik Parivahan Adhikari Karyalay,
Aoudyogik Vasahat, Madhavnagar Road, Sangli.

Claim for Recovery of Amount of Rs. 2,82,750/- with interest.

Appearances :-

For Disputant	- Ld. Adv. S. B. Olekar
For Opponent No. 1A to 1D	- Ld. Adv. N. B. Kolekar
For Opponent No. 2	- Ld. Adv. P. A. Deshmukh
For Opponent No. 3 and 4	- Self

JUDGMENT

(Delivered on 30/03/2026)


1. This dispute is filed for recovery of amount of Rs. 2,82,750/- (in words Rupees Two Lakhs Eighty - Two Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Only) with interest.

The disputant's case in brief :-

2. The disputant i.e. उप प्रादेशिक परिवहन अधिकारी कार्यालयीन सेवकांची सहकारी पतसंस्था मर्या., सांगली is a co-operative society registered under the Maharashtra State Co-operative Societies Act, 1960. It's main object is to provide loans to its members to meet their financial needs and it functions in accordance with the objectives set out in its Bye-laws.

3. Opponent No. 1 is the borrower and Opponent No.s 2 and 3 are the guarantors of the disputed loan. Opponent No.s 1 to 3 are members of the society. Opponent No. 1 is dead and Opponent No. 1A to 1D are his legal heirs and they received immovable and movable properties and Opponent No. 1D has been employed on compassionate ground.

4. It is alleged that the disputed loan, granted on 26/02/2015 for Rs.1,50,000/- (in words Rs. One Lakh Fifty Thousand only), remained unpaid, and that despite repeated reminders, opponents did not cleared dues. On the contrary Opponent No. 1A sent notice of false


30/3/2026

contention to the Disputant. Opponent Nos. 2 and 3 stood guarantors for the said loan. Therefore, the disputant constrained to file this suit.

5. Opponent Nos. 1A to 1D (legal heirs of deceased Namdev Kadam) filed written statement at Exh. 18 and denied all adverse contentions made in the dispute. It is contended that the disputant filed false dispute to recover the amount of loan that has been repaid. Opponent No. 1 has paid the loan of the disputant before 21/12/2015 and has taken 'No Due Certificate' while taking loan from "सॅलरी ऑर्नर्स को-ऑप. क्रेडीट सोसायटी, सांगली."

6. The disputant has not given any information or notice to Opponent No.s 1A to 1D since the death of Opponent No. 1 that Opponent No. 1 had loan and that it was outstanding. After one and half year after the death of Opponent No. 1 due to delay in sending family pension proposal to government made complaint against Opponent No. 4. Therefore, keeping in mind this complaint Opponent No.4 in collusion with the disputant filed this bogus, false case. The disputant has no legal existence. Therefore, the disputant has no right to file this dispute. The dispute is bogus and should be dismissed with compensatory costs of Rs.50,000/- (in words Rs. Fifty Thousand only).

7. Opponent Nos. 2 and 3 (Guarantors) filed their written statement at Exh. 20 admitted the loan transaction but contended that as per the loan agreement, if the borrower died and the society is entitled to recover the loan amount from the government dues payable to his heirs, such as gratuity and pension. Opponent No. 1's heirs (Opponent No.s 1A to 1D) are entitled to receive approximately Rs.25,00,000/- (in words Rs. Twenty-Five Lakh only) from his service benefits, and hence the recovery should be made from that amount. They should be discharged from liability as guarantors.


30/9/2026

ative Court No.

8. Opponent No. 4 filed his say at Exh. 25. He did not dispute about paragraph no.s 1 to 3, 5 in the plaint. It is contended that amount payable towards P.F., Leave Encashment, GIS, Salary and Subsistence Allowance, Group Insurance, 7th pay 1st and 2nd instalments difference paid to wife of deceased.

9. Considering rival pleadings of both sides Ld. Predecessor of this Court has framed issues at Exh. 30. I reproduced the same along with my findings recorded thereon as under -

Sr. No.	Issues	Findings
1	Does the Disputant prove the loan transaction? (वादीने वादातील कर्ज व्यवहार सिध्द केला काय?)	Yes
2	Does the Disputant prove the claim in the dispute? (वादीने वाद मागणी सिध्द केली काय?)	Partly Yes
3	Whether the Disputant Society is in existence? (वादी संस्था अस्तित्वात आहे काय?)	Yes
4	Do Opponent No. 1A to 1D proves that, there is an order of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal regarding non-recovery of the disputed loan? (वादातील कर्ज वसुल न करणेबाबत महाराष्ट्र अॅडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव्ह ट्रीब्युनलचे आदेश असलेचे जाब देणार क्र. १अ ते १ड यांनी सिध्द केले काय?)	No
5	Do Opponent No.s 1A to 1D proves that, the Disputant issued No Dues Certificate in respect of disputed loan? (वादातील कर्जाबाबत वादीने ना देय प्रमाणपत्र दिलेचे जाब देणार क्र. १अ ते १ड यांनी सिध्द केले काय?)	Yes
6	Whether Opponent No.s 2 and 3 are entitled to recover loan amount from the amount receivable to heirs of Opponent No. 1 after his death?	No

[Signature]
30/8/2026

	(कर्ज वसुली केवळ मयत जाब देणार क्र. १ च्या मृत्युपश्चात शासनाकडून वारसांना मिळणा-या रकमांमधून होणेस जाब देणार क्र. २ व ३ पात्र आहेत काय?)	
7	Whether Opponent No.s 1A to 1D are entitled to get costs of Rs. 50,000/- from the Disputant? (वादीस रु. ५०,०००/- दंड होणेस व तो जाब देणार क्र. १अ ते १ड यांना मिळणेस जाब देणार क्र. १अ ते १ड पात्र आहेत काय?)	No
8	What Order and Award? (अंतिम आदेश व निवाडा काय?)	As per Final Order

REASONS


ARGUMENTS

10. Ld. Advocate for the disputant argued that this is a recovery suit. Opponent No. 1 borrowed money with Opponent No.s 2 and 3 as guarantors. The loan was not repaid and the suit is within limitation. Notices were served. Supporting documents and witness testimonies proved that the loan remained unpaid.

11. Section 80 of the Civil Procedure Code does not apply, and recovery from gratuity is permissible. The Regional Transport Officer's approval was obtained and he is necessary party. Although, opponents contended that they were not notified, evidence shows notices were served, including one delivered by hand before the borrower's death.

12. It is further argued that opponent challenged the existence and registration of the disputant, but the disputant proved that, it is registered. Disputes over board authority and procedural validity were raised, including the absence of a resolution and the timing of Resolution No. 4. However, it has come in evidence of DW1 Pushpa Patil that the board functioned until a new one was appointed and that

[Signature]
30/3/2026



no unauthorized actions occurred. Hence, he prayed that the suit be allowed.

13. Ld. Advocate for opponent nos. 1A to 1D argued that the suit is procedurally flawed due to lack of notice to a government office and that the dispute was filed beyond the statutory three-year period. There is question of the legitimacy of the loan transaction, the institution's existence and the use of a government office address. Witnesses for both sides provided conflicting accounts. The suit was filed to harass them. Hence, he prayed that the suit be dismissed.

14. To substantiate the claim the **disputant** has examined **witness** namely DW1 Smt. Pushpa Ramrao Patil (Exh. 36) and relied on following **documents** :-

Sr. No.	Documents	Exhibit No.
1	Loan Demand Application	37
2	Loan Bond (कर्ज रोखा)	38
3	Promissory Note	38A
4	Extract of the managing committee meeting Dt. 18/02/2015	39
5	Salary Slip of Opponent No. 2	40
6	Salary Slip of Opponent No. 3	41
7	Application given by Opponent No. 1 to Society	42
8	Notice given by Disputant Society to Opponents	43
9	Letter given by Disputant to Opponent No. 4	44
10	Notice given by Opponent No. 1A to Disputant	45
11	Letter given by Opponent No. 3 to Disputant	46
12	Letter given by Opponent No. 2 to Disputant	47
13	Notice given by Disputant to Opponents through Advocate	48
14	Receipts of Notice sent to opponents	49 to 53

[Handwritten Signature]
30/3/2026

15	Extract of Resolution no.4 Dt. 19/08/2021 of the managing committee regarding filing suit.	54
16	Statement of Account	55


15. To substantiate defence **opponents** has examined **four witnesses** in total as under and proved following **documents** :-

Sr. No.	Name of the Witness	Exhibit No.
1	Smt. Sandhyarani Namdeo Kadam (Opponent No. 1A)	60
2	Sonali Vasant Kothawale (Representative of DDR)	67
3	Rohit Nandkumar Mulik (For The Sangli Salary Earner's Co-op. Society)	74
4	Vasant Ramchandra More (Opponent No. 2)	86

Sr. No.	Documents	Exhibit No.
1	Registration Certificate	70
2	Notification of Elected Board of Directors for 2014-15 to 2019-20 period	71
3	Notification of Elected Board of Directors for 2021-22 to 2026-27 period	72
4	Letter of District Deputy Registrar, Miraj	73
5	Letter of Authority	77
6	Loan Demand Application of Namdeo Gurubasu Kadam	78
7	Letter given by Namdeo Kadam to Society	79

ADMITTED FACTS :

16. Opponents admitted that the disputant disbursed disputed loan amount to opponent no.1 and to which opponent no.s 2 and 3 are guarantors.


30/3/2026

AS TO ISSUE NO. 1


17. The disputant has produced the original loan application (Exh.37), sanction letter, and account statement (Exh. 55) showing disbursement of Rs.1,50,000/- to Opponent No. 1. The oral testimony of DW1 Smt. Pushpa Patil, the disputant's secretary, (Exh. 36) is consistent with documentary evidence. As stated above the disbursement of loan amount is admitted fact. Hence, I answer issue nos. 1 in affirmative.

18. Considering the nature of **Issue No.2**, it would be more appropriate to address it **after Issue No. 6** to maintain the flow of the judgment.

AS TO ISSUE NO. 3

19. Opponent No.s 1A to 1D contended that the disputant society is not in existence. In support of this contention, they examined OW2 Smt. Sonali Kothawale (Deputy Registrar's representative) at Exh. 67. OW2 Smt. Sonali Kothawale at Exh. 67 proved documents at Exh. 68 to 72 i.e. Registration Certificate, Notification of Elected Board of directors for period 2014-15 to 2019-20, Notification of Elected Board of directors for period 2021-22 to 2026-27, letter of District Deputy Registrar, Miraj. The evidence of said witness and above-mentioned documents proves that the society is duly registered under the provisions of the M.C.S. Act, and that an elected executive committee for 2022-2027 exists with approval from the Deputy Registrar, Co-Operative Societies, Miraj.

20. Opponent No.s 1A to 1D raised defence that, the disputant does not have office. But OW1 Smt. Sandhyarani Kadam (Exh. 60) in her cross-examination admitted that the disputant received their notice on address upon which it was send. Therefore, Opponent No. 1A to 1D


30/3/2026

did not bring cogent evidence on record to prove that the disputant has no existence.


21. It is pertinent to note that opponent did not deny the disbursement of disputed loan amount by the disputant. For the sake of argument, if the disputant is not in existence, then in such situation opponent have to deny the disbursement of disputed loan amount to opponent no.1 (deceased). But it is not happened. On the contrary OW1 Smt. Sandhyarani Kadam (Exh. 60) admitted in her cross-examination that her husband borrowed Rs.1,50,000/- (Rs. One Lakh Fifty Thousand Rupees Only) on 26/02/2015 from the disputant. Hence, considering above reasons, the objection of opponents about the non-existence of the disputant society is not tenable in absence of cogent evidence. Hence, I answer issue no. 3 in affirmative.


AS TO ISSUE NO. 4

22. Opponent no.s 1A to 1D contended that the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal passed order and said order prohibiting the recovery of disputed loan. But did not adduce or tender any evidence on record in support of this contention inspite of ample opportunity. Hence, I answer issue no. 4 in negative.

AS TO ISSUE NO. 5

23. Opponent no.s 1A to 1D contended that the disputant issued "No Dues Certificate" to Opponent no.1. In support of this contention, they have examined OW3 Shri Rohit Mulik at Exh. 74. Said witness deposed for "The Sangli Salary Earners Co-operative Society, Sangli". He proved documents i.e. Loan Demand Application of Opponent no.1 and Letter given by Opponent no.1 to Society at Exh. 78 and 79 respectively. Loan Demand Application of Opponent no.1 at Exh 78 consist "No Dues Certificate" on page no.7. The disputant did


30/3/26



not raise any objection on said document. Also, the disputant decline to cross-examination of said witness.


24. Further, it has come in cross-examination of DW1 Smt. Pushpa Patil at Exh.36, that, though loan dated 26/02/2015 granted to Opponent No. 1, they issued "No Dues Certificate". Thus, considering above discussion Opponent no.s 1A to 1D succeeded to prove that the disputant issued "No Dues Certificate" to Opponent no.1. Hence, I answer issue no.5 in affirmative.

AS TO ISSUE NO. 6

25. Opponent Nos. 2 and 3 stand as guarantors for the disputed loan availed by Opponent No.1. They contented in their written statement at Exh. 20 that they are entitled to recover loan amount from the amount receivable to heirs of Opponent no.1 after his death. But they did not adduce or tender any evidence on record in support of their contention. Opponent No.2 i.e. OW4 Vasant More at Exh. 86 admitted in his cross-examination that they are also equally liable for repayment of loan amount as the borrower.

26. Under **Section 128 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872** a surety's liability is co-extensive with that of the principal debtor unless otherwise provided. The death of the principal debtor does not extinguish the liability of guarantors. The clause in the loan agreement permitting recovery from government dues does not absolve guarantors unless such recovery has actually been effected. Therefore, Opponent Nos. 2 and 3 remain jointly and severally liable along with the heirs of Opponent No. 1.

27. Moreover, Section 13 of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 and Section 60 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 shields gratuity, the retirement dues and other service benefits. Thus, Opponent


30/3/2026


no.s 2 and 3 are not entitled to get relief i.e. to recover loan amount from the amount receivable to heirs of Opponent no.1 after his death. Hence, I answer issue no. 6 in negative.

AS TO ISSUE NO. 2

28. Now, question arose whether the disputant proved claim in the dispute? Considering above discussion and findings of Issue no.s 1, 3 to 6, the disputant proved the disputed loan transaction. However, considering finding of Issue no. 6 in affirmative, Opponent no.s 1A to 1D proved that the disputant issued "No Dues Certificate" to Opponent no.1.

29. On basis of said "No Dues Certificate", Opponent no.s 1A to 1D contended that disputed loan was repaid. On the other hand, letter given by deceased borrower i.e. Opponent No.1 at Exh.32 is not challenged by Opponents. In it, deceased Opponent No.1 contended that, he required more amount. But considering the limit of the disputant for loan amount, he made loan demand of Rs. 12,00,000/- (in words Rupees Twelve Lakh Only) to "Salary Earners Society, Sangli". He assured to the disputant for repayment of disputed loan amount. Hence, he seeking "No Dues Certificate". In such circumstances though opponent no.s 1A to 1D alleged repayment, except "No Dues Certificate" no any other documentary proof or bank receipt was produced to establish that the entire loan was settled.

30. Opponent No.s 1A to 1D admitted in cross-examination of DW1 Smt. Pushpa Patil, that, though loan dated 26/02/2015 granted to Opponent No. 1, they issued "No Dues Certificate". It is further admitted that, "No Dues Certificate" issued though loan is outstanding. OW1 Smt. Sandhyarani Kadam at Exh. 60 in her cross examination admitted that they had taken a loan from the "Sangli Salary Earners Co-operative Society", while the loan taken from the disputant remains


30/3/2026




outstanding. It supports the disputant's case. Moreover, Opponent Nos. 2 and 3 have not contended that the disputed loan was repaid, a fact that operates in their favour. Opponent No. 2 Shri. Vasant More has examined himself as OW4 at Exh. 86. He reiterated contentions made in his written statement at Exh. 20. He admitted in his cross-examination that Opponent No. 1 did not repay loan amount prior to his death. It proves that, disputed loan advanced to Opponent and it was not repaid.

31. The disputant prayed for recovery of Rs. 2, 82, 750 /- together with interest accruing thereon from 01/09/2021 at the rate of 13% per annum, plus penal interest at the rate of 2%, along with the court costs of this dispute (including legal fees), to be recovered jointly and severally, in a lump sum, from Opponent No.s 1A to 1D, 2, and 3. It is also prayed that the loan amount be recovered from Opponent No. 4 out of the sums payable by the said Opponent to the legal heirs of Opponent No. 1 namely, Opponent No.s 1A to 1D and appropriate orders to this effect be issued to Opponent No. 4.

32. Considering findings given on Issue No.s 1, 3 to 6 and discussion thereon with reasons, documents on record, Opponent No.s 1A to 1D, as legal heirs of Late Namdev Gurubasu Kadam, and Opponents Nos. 2 and 3, as guarantors, they are jointly and severally liable to pay Rs. 2,79,750/- (in words Rupees Two Lakhs Seventy-Nine Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Only) to the disputant society along with interest at the rate of 13% per annum from the date 01/09/2021 till its complete realization.

33. However, the disputant did not lead or tender any evidence on record to prove that the sums payable by Opponent no.4 to the legal heirs of Opponent No. 1 namely Namdeo Gurubasu Kadam i.e.


30/3/2026

Opponent No.s 1A to 1D to pass appropriate order. Hence, I answer issue no.2 in partly affirmative.

AS TO ISSUE NO. 7


34. Opponent No.s 1A to 1D prayed for costs of Rs. 50,000/- (in words Fifty Thousand Only) from the disputant as it caused physical, mental, and economic harassment to them without any reason. But, Opponent No.s 1A to 1D did not lead any evidence on record in support of their contention. Therefore, in absence of cogent evidence Opponent No. 1A to 1D are not entitled for costs of Rs. 50,000/- (in words Fifty Thousand Only) from the disputant. Hence, I answer issue no. 7 in negative.


AS TO ISSUE NO. 8

35. In view of findings of Issue no.s 1 to 7, the suit is required to be decreed partly. Opponent Nos. 1A to 1D, as legal heirs of late Namdev Gurubasu Kadam, and Opponents Nos. 2 and 3, as guarantors, they are jointly and severally liable to pay Rs.2,79,750/- (in words Rupees Two Lakhs Seventy-Nine Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Only) to the disputant society along with interest at the rate of 13% per annum from the date 01/09/2021 till realization. Considering the nature of dispute, it is just and proper that parties to bear their own costs. Hence, in order to answer issue no.8, I pass following order :-

ORDER

1. The dispute is partly allowed.
2. Opponents Nos. 1A to 1D, as legal heirs of late Namdev Gurubasu Kadam, and Opponents Nos. 2 and 3, as guarantors, are jointly and severally liable to pay Rs.2,79,750/- (in words Rupees Two Lakhs Seventy-Nine Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Only) to the





20/3/2026


disputant society along with interest at the rate of 13% per annum from the date 01/09/2021 till realization.


3. Parties shall bear their own costs.
4. Award be drawn up accordingly.

(Pronounced and dictated in Open Court.)

Place : Sangli
Date : 30/03/2026




20/3/2026
(Smt. S. V. Jadhav)
Judge,
Co-Operative Court No.I,
Sangli.



IN THE COURT OF JUDGE CO-OPERATIVE COURT
NO.1 AT SANGLI

(Presided over by Smt. S. V. Jadhav)

C.C. No: 137/2021
Exh. 98

Up Pradeshik Parivahan Adhikari Karyalayin
Sewakanchi Sahkari Patsanstha Marya, Sangli
Through Secretary Shri. Jagannath Rau Patil.
Age – 70, Occu.- Service,
R/o. Plot No. 193, Ghanshyamnagar, Sangli.
Mo. No. 9763759995.

... Disputant

Versus

1. Late Namdeo Gurbasu Kadam (Legal Heirs)

... Opponents

1A. Smt. Sandhyarani Namdeo Kadam.

Age – 55, Occu.- Housework,

1B. Swapnil Namdeo Kadam.

Age – 29, Occu.- Service,

1C. Shubham Namdeo Kadam.

Age – 27, Occu.- Education,

1D. Kum. Komal Namdeo Kadam.

Age – 24, Occu.- Service,

All R/o. Mangesh Apartment, Sangram Chowk,
Gaonbhag, Sangli.

2. Shri. Vasant Ramchandra More

Age – 60, Occu.- Retired,

R/o. Near Vasantdada Kusti Kendra, Yashwantnagar,
Sangli


3. Shri. Amar Nivrutti Mahekar

Age – 46, Occu.- Service,

R/o. Through Up Pradeshik Parivahan Karyalay,
Aoudyogik Vasahat, Madhavnagar Rd, Sangli.

4. Up Pradeshik Parivahan Adhikari Karyalay,

Aoudyogik Vasahat, Madhavnagar Road, Sangli.



20/3/2026

Claim for Recovery of Amount of Rs. 2,82,750/- with interest.

Appearances :-

For Disputant	- Ld. Adv. S. B. Olekar
For Opponent No. 1A to 1D	- Ld. Adv. N. B. Kolekar
For Opponent No. 2	- Ld. Adv. P. A. Deshmukh
For Opponent No. 3 and 4	- Self

AWARD

Present dispute was filed for recovery of amount. Whereas it has come before me for the final adjudication on 30/03/2026. Thus, after final adjudication it is ordered that:-

1. The dispute is partly allowed.
2. Opponents Nos. 1A to 1D, as legal heirs of late Namdev Gurubasu Kadam, and Opponents Nos. 2 and 3, as guarantors, are jointly and severally liable to pay Rs.2,79,750/- (in words Rupees Two Lakhs Seventy-Nine Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Only) to the disputant society along with interest at the rate of 13% per annum from the date 01/09/2021 till realization.
3. Parties shall bear their own costs.
4. Award be drawn up accordingly.


:- BILL OF COST :-


<u>Sr. No.</u>	<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Disputant</u>	<u>Opponents</u>
(1)	Court Fee Deposit	Rs.3,840/-	---
(2)	Advocate Fee	Rs.2,529/-	Rs.2,529/-
(3)	Process Fees	Rs.140/-	---
	TOTAL	Rs.6,614/-	Rs.2,529/-

(Rupees **Six Thousand Six Hundred Fourteen** Only)

GIVEN under my hand and Seal of the Court on 30/03/2026

Place : Sangli
Date : 30/03/2026




 30/03/2026
 (Smt. S. V. Jadhav)
 Judge,
 Co-Operative Court No.I,
 Sangli.