

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 4486 OF 2013**

Bank of Baroda,
Through Branch Manager Madhav P. Sabnis ... Petitioner
vs.
The State of Maharashtra and others ... Respondents

**WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 1912 OF 2026
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 4486 OF 2013**

Vidhii Partners, Advocates, ... Applicant

In the matter between:

Bank of Baroda,
Through Branch Manager Madhav P. Sabnis ... Petitioner
vs.
The State of Maharashtra and others ... Respondents

Mr. Archit Rao (through video-conferencing), i/b. Vidhii Partners for petitioner in WP/4486/13 and applicant in IA/1912/26.

Mr. Yatin Shashikant Khochare, 'B' panel counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2-State authorities.

Ms. Amisha Jain, i/b. MDP Associates for respondent No.3.

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

DATE : 16th MARCH, 2026

P.C. :

Interim Application No.1912 of 2026:

. By this application, the advocates appearing for the petitioner-bank are seeking discharge. Along with the application, the applicants have annexed copy of a letter dated 11.09.2019 addressed to the advocates by the Deputy General Manager of the petitioner-

bank, stating that the said advocates, on their request, stood removed from the panel of advocates representing the petitioner-bank.

2. In view of the said communication, we are inclined to allow this application. It appears that the petitioner-bank has not arranged for any other advocate to represent it.

3. In view of the above, the application is allowed and the advocates representing the petitioner-bank are discharged from appearing for the petitioner-bank.

4. Interim Application No.1912 of 2026 stands disposed of.

Writ Petition No.4486 of 2013:

5. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents inform this Court that when this writ petition was entertained, the Cyber Appellate Tribunal was not available. In that backdrop, on 15.01.2014, this Court issued rule and granted interim relief, further observing that as and when the appellate tribunal is validly constituted, the parties would be at liberty to move this Court.

6. The interim order was subject to the petitioner-bank depositing an amount of ₹ 1,20,000 in this Court. The respondent was allowed to withdraw the said amount, subject to furnishing adequate bank guarantee. The said bank guarantee has been recently renewed on 10.03.2026.

7. The learned counsel for the respondents submit that now, as per section 48 of The Information Technology Act, 2000, the

appellate authority is The Telecom Disputes Settlement and Appellate Tribunal and that the petitioner-bank can move the said tribunal for relief.

8. We find substance in the contention raised on behalf of the respondents. But, since the advocates appearing for the petitioner-bank are discharged today, it would be appropriate that notice is issued to the petitioner-bank.

9. In view of the above, issue notice to the petitioner-Bank of Baroda for making alternative arrangement and for appearing before this Court, in the light of the observations made hereinabove. The notice shall be returnable on 16.04.2026, High on Board.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)

Priya Kambli