



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 6029 OF 2026

Jayram Nathuji Salunke

VERSUS

The District Co Operative Election Officer And Others

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. C.V. Bodkhe h/f Mr. Gore Ravindra  
Vitthal

Advocate for Respondent No.1 : Mr. S.K. Kadam

Advocate for Respondent No.2 : Mr. G.P. Darandale

Advocate for Respondent No.3 : Mr. K.J. Suryawanshi

...

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.

DATED : JUNE 17, 2026

PER COURT :-

1. Present petition takes exception to order dated 09.06.2026 passed by District Co-operative Election Officer below Objection No.64/2026, whereby petitioner's objection to nomination of respondent no.2 came to be turned down.

2. On 29.05.2026, respondent no.1 – District Co-operative Election Officer published election program for District Central Co-operative Bank Limited Aurangabad. Respondent No.3 was nominated as delegate of member society. The petitioner submitted objection to his nomination on the ground that society to which he represents was a defaulter and he was director of such society during period from 24.07.2022 to 25.09.2025. As such, not eligible to contest election in terms of Section 73 CA (1)(i)(f)(ii) of Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act. Respondent no.1 declined to entertain objection on the



ground that a member of defaulting credit society can be nominated as delegate. Respondent no.3 was not director as on qualifying date for election as per election program.

3. Learned advocate appearing for petitioner submits that resignation from directorship was deliberately given by respondent no.3 knowing that election program will be published and such resignation from directorship of society would not wash out disqualification incurred by director. *Prima facie*, aforesaid argument cannot be accepted for the reason that disqualification is prescribed only to nominate directors of defaulting societies and not members. Further, as on qualifying date prescribed as per election program, respondent no.3 was mere member of society and not director. Therefore, view taken by returning officer under impugned order is a possible view.

4. In that view of matter, writ petition stands dismissed, keeping all contentions open to be raised post election.

(S.G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.)