

CNR-MHSN170025432020	Received on	:	25/01/2023
	Registered on	:	10/02/2023
	Decided on	:	24/06/2026
	Duration	:	3 Yrs. 4 Mths. 30 Ds.
	Exh. No.	:	27

IN THE DISTRICT COURT, VITA, AT VITA
(Presided over by R.R. Bhagwat, District Judge-1, Vita)

MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL APPEAL NO. 190/2024
(OLD MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL APPEAL NO.34/2023)

Special Recovery Officer,)
Shri Datta Nagari Sahakari Patsanstha Myd.)
Kadegaon Tal. Kadegaon Dist. Sangli)
Mr. Javed Ayub Kotwal)
Age-67 Years, Occu. Service) **Appellant**
R/o. Kadegaon Tal. Kadegaon Dist. Sangli) (Ori.Def. No.1)

VERSUS

1. Mr. Sunil Parashram Patil)
Age-55 Years, Occu. Agriculturist & Advocate)
R/o. Kadegaon Tal. Kadegaon Dist.Sangli)
2. Mr. Avinash Parashram Patil)
Age-57 Years, Occu. Agriculturist)
R/o. Kotavade Tal. Kadegaon Dist.Sangli)
3. Mr. Sagar Subhash Patil) **Respondents**
Age-32 Years, Occu. Agriculturist) (Ori. Plaintiffs &
R/o. Vasantrao Gaikwad Chawal, Behind) **Defendants No.3**
Government Rest House, Kadegaon) **to 7)**
Tal.Kadegaon Dist.Sangli)
4. Mrs. Sadhana Sudhir Suryawanshi)
Age – 36 Years, Occu. Agriculturist)
R/o.Sarpanch Mala, Kheradi Vangi,)
Tal. Kadegaon Dist. Sangli)

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| 5. Mrs. Sujata Somnath Gujar |) | |
| Age – 38 Years, Occu. Agriculturist |) | |
| R/o. Bhosare Tal. Khatav Dist. Satara |) | |
| 6. Mrs. Nirmaladevi Subhash Patil |) | |
| Age – 59 Years, Occu. Agriculturist |) | |
| R/o. Vasantrao Gaikwad Chawal, Behind |) | |
| Government Rest House, Kadegaon |) | |
| Tal. Kadegaon Dist. Sangli |) | <u>Respondents</u> |
| 7. Mrs. Prabhavati @ Parvati Ishwara Mane |) | (Ori. Plaintiffs & |
| Age – 63 Years, Occu. Agriculturist |) | Defendants No.3 |
| R/o. Om Nivas, Samarthanagar, Shirgaon, |) | to 7) |
| Near Asarambapu Ashram, Badalapur Tal. |) | |
| Ambarnath Dist. Thane |) | |

**Appeal under Section 104 and Order 43 Rule 1(r) of
Code of Civil Procedure, 1908**

Ld. Counsel Shri. J. K. Kumbhar for the appellant.

Ld. Counsel Shri. S. P. Sagare for respondents No.1 to 3 and 6.

None for respondents No.4, 5 and 7.

: JUDGMENT :

(Delivered on 24/06/2026)

1. This is an appeal preferred by the appellant (original defendant No.1) against order passed below Exh.5 dt.23/12/2022 in Regular Civil Suit No.328/2021 by Ld. Civil Judge, Junior Division, Kadegaon, Tal. Kadegaon, Dist. Sangli allowing application for temporary injunction filed by the plaintiffs.

2. Perused appeal memo, replies filed by the respondents, paper book and documents placed on record. I have also gone through written notes of arguments Exh.18 filed by Ld. Counsel Shri. J. K.

Kumbhar for the appellant and written notes of arguments Exh.20 and 22 filed by Ld. Counsel Shri. S. P. Sagare for respondents No.1 to 3 and 6. Heard Ld. Counsel Shri. J. K. Kumbhar for the appellant and Ld. Counsel Shri. S. P. Sagare for respondents No.1 to 3 and 6.

3. The appellant is original defendant No.1. Respondents No.1 and 2 are plaintiffs No.1 and 2 respectively. Respondents No.3 to 7 are defendants No.3 to 7 respectively. (Parties are being referred as per their status before the trial Court).

4. **The plaintiffs have filed the suit with following pleadings:-**

The suit property is consisting of Gat No.279 area 1 Hector 20 R and Gat No.381 area 0-50 HR of village Kotavade Tal. Kadegaon Dist. Sangli. Defendant No.1 obtained illegal recovery certificate from Assistant Registrar, Co-operative Society, Kadegaon on 19/09/2008 in respect of the suit property. Subsequently, defendant No.2 i.e. Circle Inspector, Kadegaon issued notice dt. 27/10/2021. Predecessor in title of the plaintiffs and defendants No.3 to 7 namely Parashram was owner and possessor of the suit property. Parashram died on 09/11/2012. The plaintiffs and predecessor in title of defendants No.3 to 5 i.e. Subhash are sons of Parashram. Defendant No.7 is daughter of Parashram. Defendant No.6 is wife of deceased Subhash. After elaborating relationship between the parties, it is contended that Parashram had obtained loan of Rs.3,50,000/- from defendant No.1 Credit Society in the year 2001 by mortgaging the suit property. He had repaid the loan amount from time to time to defendant No.1. Loan amount was obtained for grocery business. Defendant No.1 assessed interest on the loan amount by playing fraud upon the plaintiffs and they have shown loan amount of Rs. 6,50,000/- in the year 2004. It is

mentioned in the accounts that amount of Rs.6,50,000/- was paid to predecessor in title of the plaintiffs, but such huge amount was never paid to him. Loan amount has reached up to Rs.12,75,058/- as on 26/03/2004. Defendant No.1 filed application under Section 101 of the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960 (for short, "the Act") for obtaining recovery certificate and made demand of recovery certificate of Rs.12,75,058/- on 12/09/2008. Decision was taken hurriedly on 19/09/2008. No notice was given for recovery of the loan amount. Reply of the plaintiffs and defendants No.3 to 7 was not obtained by Assistant Registrar, Co-operative Societies and illegal exparte decision was given by issuing recovery certificate of Rs.12,75,058/-.

5. Defendant No.1 Credit Co-operative Society had informed to predecessor in title of defendants No.3 to 6 namely Subhash that loan amount is Rs.66,000/- and he was asked to pay his 1/3rd share of the loan amount. Accordingly, Subhash had paid Rs.22,000/- to defendant No.1. He was informed that he had no liability in respect of the loan amount after payment of Rs.22,000/- Even then, loan account was kept in force by cheating them.

6. Predecessor in title of the plaintiffs was dead and even then, demand notice was issued to him. Defendant No.1 Society had created charge on the suit property and other properties of the plaintiffs. When the plaintiffs raised objection, an inquiry was conducted and charge over other properties of the plaintiffs was removed. Now, there is charge over the suit property only to the extent of loan amount of Rs.3,50,000/- Predecessor in title of the plaintiffs had never taken loan of Rs. 6,50,000/- and it is confirmed from entries in 7/12 extract. By showing wrong information regarding loan amount,

illegal recovery certificate is obtained. After questioning legality of notice dt. 27/10/2021, it is prayed to declare that recovery certificate dt. 19/09/2008 obtained by defendant No.1 in respect of loan taken by mortgaging the suit property should be cancelled and it is not binding upon the plaintiffs and defendants No.3 to 7. They also prayed for cancellation of notice dt.27/10/2021 issued by defendant No.2. They prayed for relief of permanent injunction restraining defendant No.2 from taking action of recovery of possession of the suit property on the strength of notice dt.27/10/2021 issued as per illegal recovery certificate dt.19/09/2008. They raised all these contentions in application for temporary injunction (Exh.5) and sought relief of temporary injunction.

7. Defendant No.1 filed written statement cum reply to temporary injunction application with following pleadings :-

The plaintiffs will have to prove that present litigation has civil nature. The Civil Court has no jurisdiction to try the suit against defendant No.1 a public servant. Defendant No.1 Society is registered under provisions of the Act. When predecessor in title of the plaintiffs and defendants No.3 to 7 have obtained loan from defendant No.1 Credit Society, they would have to obtain orders from the appropriate forum. Civil Court has no jurisdiction to cancel order passed under provisions of the Act. Case of the plaintiffs is specifically denied and it is prayed to dismiss the suit with compensatory cost of Rs. 25,000/- payable to defendant No.1.

8. After considering rival submissions, Ld. Trial Court passed the impugned order. Defendant No.1 has challenged legality of the impugned order on following grounds:-

The impugned order is wrong and improper. Ld. Trial Court has erred in not considering basic principles of law that prima-facie case and balance of convenience are in favour of appellant. The impugned order is against the principles of natural justice, equity and good conscience. Ld. Trial Court has made gross error in giving findings on issue No. 1 to 4 and therefore, caused injustice to the appellant. Ld. Trial Court has not properly perused the documents placed on record by the appellant on record and not perused the contents of the said documents. The original suit is filed by plaintiff for declaration and injunction, wherein he prays for cancellation of recovery certificate issued under Section 101 of the Act along-with other reliefs. The Act is a special enactment to deal with issues of co-operative societies including recovery issues and therefore, the issue in dispute raised by the plaintiff in his plaint before Ld. Trial Court is having no jurisdiction to entertain and adjudicate the issue. Application below Exh.5 raised by plaintiff is also without jurisdiction. When the original suit is barred by the law, then subsequent injunction application is also barred by the law. This basic legal principle is ignored by Ld. Trial Court and passed illegal order. It is admitted facts on record that defendant No.1 is a Co-operative Society registered under the Act, predecessor of the plaintiffs is the borrower and defaulter of defendant No.1 society, defendant No.1 is appointed as recovery officer under the provisions of the Act to recover loan amounts along-with interest from defaulting borrowers. When these facts were admitted by both parties in that case, the Civil Court has no jurisdiction to try and entertain any disputes in respect of recovery of loan amount from a borrower. As per section 163 of the Act, there is a bar of jurisdictions of Courts i.e. no Civil or Revenue Court shall have any jurisdiction in respect of any disputes raised by the

plaintiffs in main suit. This legal provision is totally overlooked by Ld. Trial Court and passed illegal order.

9. Recovery certificate issued by Registrar of Co-Operative Societies u/s. 101 of the Act shall be final and a conclusive proof of arrears stated to be due therein, and the same shall be recoverable according to the law for the time being in force. Therefore, said recovery certificate shall be treated as decree of a Civil Court. Execution of the said certificate shall be done as per rules of the Act and defendant No.1 had a legal right to execute the order of said certificate issued u/s. 101 of the Act. A revision shall lie against such grant of certificate in the manner laid down under Section 154 of the Act. Such certificate shall not be liable to be questioned in any Court. This legal provision is overlooked by Ld. Trial Court and passed illegal order. Defendant No.1 has started execution of the certificate issued u/s.101 of the Act. There are funds of depositors in the bank which is utilized for granting and disbursing loan amount. Therefore, in the interest of large public said loan amounts need to be recovered along-with interest within stipulated period or as early as possible. Therefore, granting the injunction against defendant No.1 in respect of recovery of loan amount from defaulter borrower is not correct and legal. Civil Court is having no jurisdiction to interfere with the orders passed by the legal authorities/forums established under the provisions of the Act. The plaintiff has failed to show his all bonafides and facts of the disputed matter and prayed for injunction against recovery. Without considering the legal aspects and bonafides of the parties Ld. Trial Court has passed an order on the basis of false notions. Order passed by the Registrar under the provisions of section 101 of the Act shall be treated as a money decree. Execution of a money decree cannot be stayed without depositing of decretal

amount. In this matter, the Registrar had issued a certificate u/s.101 after making such inquiry. Therefore, recovery certificate is obtained by the appellant society after following due procedure and said certificate has not been challenged by the plaintiffs u/s 154 of the Act. In this situation, said certificate is having attained finality and cannot be challenged in Civil Court. This legal aspect is totally overlooked by the Ld. Trial Court.

10. As per section 164 of the Act, no suit shall be instituted against the Society, or any of its Officers' in respect of any act touching to business of the Society until the expiration of 2 month next after notice in writing has been delivered to the Registrar and the plaint shall contain a statement to that effect. This is a mandatory provision. There is no scope or provision to waive notice. But Ld. Trial Court has overlooked this legal provision and waived the notice & the suit has been registered without having jurisdiction. The suit is not maintainable because the plaintiffs had not issued the mandatory notice u/s. 164 of the Act. Ld. Trial Court erred in giving finding that defendant No.1 ought to have on record legal heirs of deceased Parasharam i.e. on the certificate issued by Registrar of the Act u/s. 101. Certificate issued u/s. 101 is money decree. There is no legal provision to bring legal heirs on record of proceeding relating to recovery certificate. As per law, there is no need to make changes in decree when any of the judgment debtor has been died. Decree holder can execute said decree against legal heirs of the deceased person in execution proceeding without amending the decree. Decree can be amended only by the appellate authorities. This legal provision is overlooked by Ld. Trial Court. The plaintiffs had not preferred any objection before defendant No.1 i.e. recovery officer under Rule 107(19)(a) of Maharashtra Co-Operative Societies Rules,

1961 (for short “the Rules”) in respect of attachment of the property in dispute or otherwise. Unless and until objections preferred under this Rule are not disposed off on merits or order passed by the recovery officer, the plaintiffs have no right to institute the suit before the Civil Court. This provision of law is overlooked by Ld. Trial Court. Ld. Trial Court overlooked provisions of the Specific Relief Act and passed the order of injunction against defendant No.1. The order passed by Ld. Trial Court is totally wrong and against the provisions of law. The plaintiffs have smartly drafted the suit for declaration and permanent injunction, but after perusal of the plaint it is clearly seen that the plaintiffs are actually challenging the recovery certificate issued by the Registrar of Co-operative Societies, Kadegaon dated 19/09/2008. Said averment is made by the plaintiffs in para 1(b) of the plaint. Civil Court have no jurisdiction to interfere with the order passed u/s.101 of the Act. Ld. Trial Court has failed to consider the evidence of defendant No.1 and erred in relying on evidence of the plaintiffs while passing the order below Exh. 5 in R.C.S. No. 328/2021. Ld. Trial Court has wrongly concluded jurisdiction of the Civil Court. Ld. Trial Court has failed to consider that after following due procedure of law, possession of the mortgaged property has been handed over by the Mandal Adhikari to defendant No.1 and in that respect, he has prepared Panchnama and deed of possession (Kabje Pavati). These documents have legal and valid presumption in respect of possession of the property. In said situation, application of the plaintiffs at Exh.5 for temporary injunction has become infructuous. Therefore, said application deserves to be rejected. Ld. Trial Court drawn wrong inference by stating that it is only a documentary possession and passed illegal order. Ld. Trial Court has failed to consider and peruse all material facts pleaded in the say

and written statement and passed illegal order. He prayed for allowing the appeal and for setting aside impugned order.

11. **Ld. Counsel Shri. J. K. Kumbhar for the appellant/ defendant No.1 filed notes of arguments Exh.18 with contentions as under :-**

Ld. Counsel Shri. J. K. Kumbhar for the appellant/ defendant No.1 raised objections on the line of contents in appeal memo as referred above. After relying provision of Section 101(1) of the Act, it is contended that remedy of revision is available under Section 154 of the Act regarding issuance of recovery certificate. Ld. Trial Court has no jurisdiction to entertain and adjudicate the issue. There is bar to jurisdiction of the Civil Courts as per Section 163 of the Act. Recovery certificate issued under Section 101 of the Act is final and conclusive. Two months notice under Section 164 of the Act is necessary to be issued before filing suit against a society or any of its officers in respect of any act touching the business of the society. Ld. Trial Court ignored statutory provisions. Ld. Trial Court has committed error in holding legal heirs of deceased Parashram ought to have been brought on record in the proceeding before Registrar of the Co-operative Societies. After contending errors in decision of Ld. Trial Court, he relied upon observations in the case of **Special Recovery Officer/Sales Officer, Dr. Annasaheb Chougule Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd. Vs. Suhas Balkrishna Shete & Ors. reported in 2014(4) ALL MR 785** for giving stress upon his submissions regarding lack of jurisdiction to Civil Court. After following necessary procedure, possession of the suit property has been handed over to defendant No.1 by defendant No.2. Panchanama is prepared. Kabjepatti/ possession receipt is also prepared. In such circumstances, application Exh.5 had become infructuous. Therefore, it deserves to be rejected.

12. Ld. Counsel Shri. S. P. Sagare for the respondents/ the original plaintiffs filed written notes of arguments (Exh.20 and Exh.22) with following submissions :-

Defendant No.1 had filed application under Order VII Rule 11 of Code of Civil Procedure before Ld. Trial Court and it was rejected. Ld. Trial Court reached to the conclusion that present suit or dispute is having civil nature and the suit is maintainable before Ld. Trial Court. Defendant No.1 has not preferred any appeal against order on the said application. Application Exh.5 is allowed after considering documentary evidence on record. Defendant No.1 obtained order of recovery certificate within eight days from the date of filing of the proceeding. Wrong recovery certificate is obtained by showing loan amount of Rs.6,50,000/- Section 9-A of the Code of Civil Procedure is repealed. It is shown to Ld. Trial Court that litigation has civil nature. Citations submitted to Ld. Trial Court may be considered. He relied upon observations in the case of **Maharashtra State Co-operative Society Housing Finance Corporation Limited Vs. Prabhakar Sitaram Bhadange in Civil Appeal No.1488 of 2017 decided on 13th March 2017** for stating that Civil Court has jurisdiction to deal with the matter. He supported impugned order and prayed for dismissal of the appeal.

13. Following points arose for my determination and I have recorded findings thereon for the reasons stated thereunder:-

S.N.	Points	Findings
1	Whether the plaintiffs have prima-facie case?	In the negative
2	Whether balance of convenience lies in favour of the plaintiffs?	In the negative

3	Whether the plaintiffs will suffer irreparable loss if temporary injunction is not granted?	In the negative
4	Whether impugned order needs interference?	In the affirmative
5	What order?	As per final order

: REASONS :

As to points No.1 to 5 :-

14. Considering overall contents in the plaint and application Exh.5, it appears that deceased Parashram had obtained loan of Rs.3,50,000/- from defendant No.1. If copy of mortgage deed of the year 2001 executed by Parashram in favour of defendant No.1 is perused carefully, there is clear reference of mortgaging the suit property for ensuring repayment of loan amount of Rs.3,50,000/-. 7/12 extracts of the suit property are also having loan liability of Rs.3,50,000/- payable to defendant No.1. If account register of defendant No.1 is seen, total loan amount of Rs.6,50,000/- is shown to have been disbursed to defendant No.1. Similarly, recovery certificate dt. 19/09/2008 is issued for recovery of principal amount of Rs.6,50,000/- with accrued interest thereon. Subsequently, action is initiated for attachment of the suit property and taking possession thereof as reflecting from documents of revenue authority i.e. defendant No.2.

15. In the backdrop of above developments, the plaintiffs have challenged legality of recovery certificate by stating that recovery certificate is issued within period of seven days from the date of moving

application to Registrar, Co-operative Societies without extending them opportunity to raise any objection. On the contrary, defendant No.1 has raised legal point of maintainability of the suit in the Civil Court. For this purpose, Ld. Counsel Shri. J. K. Kumbhar for defendant No.1 relied upon observations in the case of **Special Recovery Officer/ Sales Officer, Dr. Annasaheb Chougule Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd. Vs. Suhas Balkrishna Shete & Ors. reported in 2014(4) ALL MR 785** for stating that notice under Section 164 of the Act is necessary. He relied upon observations in the case of **Satguru Construction Co. Pvt. Ltd. and Others Vs. GR. Bombay Co-Operative Bank Ltd. reported in 2007(3) Mh.L.J. 843** for stating that jurisdiction of the Civil Court in respect of any dispute referred to the Co-Operative Court or in execution of proceedings arising therefrom is ousted in view of bar under Section 163 of the Act.

16. I have gone through above citations. If observations in the case of **Special Recovery Officer/ Sales Officer, Dr. Annasaheb Chougule Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd. Vs. Suhas Balkrishna Shete & Ors. reported in 2014(4) ALL MR 785** are perused, it has been specifically stated in para (6) that auction sale of the property sold by guarantors or borrowers can be challenged by availing remedy under Rule 107(19) of the Maharashtra Co-Operative Societies Rules, 1961 and thereafter, service of notice under Section 164 of the Act is not required before filing the suit. Similarly, in the case of **Satguru Construction Co. Pvt. Ltd. and Others Vs. GR. Bombay Co-Operative Bank Ltd. reported in 2007(3) Mh.L.J. 843** proceedings under Order XXI Rule 37 of the Code of Civil Procedure was initiated for execution of recovery certificate issued under Section 101(3) of the Act and it was held that jurisdiction of Civil Court was ousted in view of remedy available under Section 163 of the Act. Rule 107 is also relied for elaborating modes of execution of recovery

certificate.

17. In the light of observations in above referred two citations, it is necessary to consider legal proposition. Recovery certificate is issued as per Section 101(1) and 101(2) of the Act. It has been specifically provided in Section 101(3) of the Act that certificate granted by the Registrar under Sub-Section 1 or 2 of Section 101 shall be final and conclusive proof of the arrears stated to be due therein and revision shall lie against such order or grant of certificate, in a manner laid down under Section 154 and such certificate shall not be liable to be questioned in any Court. Section 154[2(A)] of the Act lays down that no application for revision shall be entertained against the recovery certificate issued by the Registrar under Section 101 unless the applicant deposits with the concerned Society, 50% amount of the total amount of recoverable dues. It has been further provided in Section 154(3) of the Act that no application for revision shall be entertained, if made after two months of the date of communication of the decision or order. Section 156 of the Act authorizes Registrar or an Officer of such Society as may be notified by the State Government to recover amount under a certificate issued under Section 101 of the Act. Section 163(1) of the Act bars jurisdiction of the Court in respect of the matters relating to registration of a society, dispute required to be referred to Co-operative Court for decision and in matter concerned with the winding up and dissolution of a society. It has been further clarified in Section 163(3) of the Act that all orders, decisions or awards passed in accordance with this Act or the Rules shall, subject to the provisions of appeal or revision in this Act be final and no such order, decision or award shall be liable to be challenged, set aside, modified, revised or declared void in any Court upon the merits or upon any other ground

whatsoever.

18. If legal proposition set out in above two paragraphs is considered, the Civil Court has no jurisdiction to decide legality of recovery certificate issued by Assistant Registrar or Registrar of the Co-Operative Societies. If reasoning in impugned order is perused, Ld. Trial Court has wrongly appreciated effect of above referred citation of **Satguru Construction Co. Pvt. Ltd. and Others Vs. GR. Bombay Co-Operative Bank Ltd. reported in 2007(3) Mh.L.J. 843** in para (21) and held that the suit is maintainable. Ld. Trial Court failed to consider that the plaintiffs were having legal remedy within frame work of the Act. They were expected to prefer revision against order of issuance of recovery certificate under Section 101 of the Act by approaching higher authority. They were also expected to explain particularly when they got knowledge of issuance of recovery certificate in order to elaborate aspect of limitation for availing remedy of revision under Section 154(1) of the Act in consonance with Section 154(3) of the Act. The plaintiffs have attempted to stall recovery proceeding of the loan amount by approaching the Civil Court. Jurisdiction of the Civil Court is expressly barred. Mechanism is provided for redressing grievance of all aggrieved persons in the Act. Therefore, the suit itself is not maintainable. Ld. Trial Court has taken wrong view regarding existence of prima-facie case, balance of convenience and greater hardship likely to be caused to the plaintiffs by ignoring legal proposition. In the result, impugned order is liable to be set aside. Therefore, I record my findings as to points No.1 to 3 in the negative, as to point No.4 in the affirmative and to record my finding as to point No.5, I pass the following order:-

: ORDER :

1. Misc. Civil Appeal No.190/2024 (Old Misc. Civil Appeal No.34/2023) is hereby allowed.
2. Order passed below Exh.5 dt.23/12/2022 in Regular Civil Suit No.328/2021 by Ld. Civil Judge, Junior Division, Kadegaon, Tal. Kadegaon, Dist. Sangli allowing application for temporary injunction filed by the plaintiffs granting relief of temporary injunction against defendant No.1 in respect of the suit property consisting of Gat No.279 area 1 Hectar 20 R and Gat No.381 area 0-50 HR of village Kotavade Tal. Kadegaon Dist. Sangli is hereby set aside.
3. Application Exh.5 in Regular Civil Suit No.328/2021 pending before Ld. Civil Judge, Junior Division, Kadegaon, Tal. Kadegaon, Dist. Sangli is hereby rejected.
4. Parties to bear their own costs.
5. Proceeding of Misc. Civil Appeal No.190/2024 (Old Misc. Civil Appeal No.34/2023) is closed.

(Dictated and pronounced in open Court)

Vita.
dt.24/06/2026

(R.R. Bhagwat)
District Judge-1, Vita

<u>CERTIFICATE</u> I affirm that, the contents of this PDF File Order are same, word to word, as per the original order.	
Name of Stenographer	G.S.Parve (Grade - I)
Name of Court	District Judge – 1 & Additional Sessions Judge, Vita
Date of Order	24/06/2026
Order signed by the Presiding Officer	24/06/2026
Order uploaded on	24/06/2026