

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CRIMINAL) Diary No(s).58303/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 02-09-2026 in CRLWP No. 371/2026 02-09-2026 in CRLWP No. 372/2026 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay at Nagpur]

AMRAVATI DISTRICT CENTRAL COOPERATIVE BANK LTD, AMRAVATI
Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

RAVINDRA VITTHALRAO GAIGOLE & ORS. Respondent(s)

IA No. 291959/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 291957/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 291955/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..)

WITH

Diary No(s). 58117/2026 (II-A)

FOR PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) ON IA 292269/2026
FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 292270/2026

FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 292272/2026

IA No. 292270/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 292272/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 292269/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..)

Date : 28-09-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ MISRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIJAY BISHNOI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. D. S. Naidu, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Salim Ambar Inamdar, Adv.
Mr. Vishal Banshal, Adv.
Mrs. Pragya Baghel- 1841, AOR
Mr. Yuvraj Kashyap, Adv.

Mr. Vipin Sanghi, Adv.
Mr. Satyajit A. Desai, Adv.
Mr. Pratik Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Shashank Upadhyay, Adv.
Mr. Sachin Singh, Adv.
Ms. Anagha S. Desai- 1588, AOR

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Permission to file special leave petitions is granted.
2. The submission on behalf of the petitioners is that the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960 (for short '1960 Act') and the Rules framed thereunder constitute a complete code where under complaints regarding financial irregularities can be made to the Registrar and the Registrar, *inter alia*, has power to call for audit report and, thereafter, take action if required. In such circumstances, there was no justification to direct for a preliminary inquiry by the police authorities. It has been submitted that decision of this Court in *Lalita Kumari vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh & Ors.*¹ does not specifically deal with those cases where there are statutory provisions to deal with complaints regarding financial irregularities as are found in the 1960 Act. It has also been submitted that the High Court in clear and categorical terms did not find the allegations disclosing commission of any cognizable offence and, therefore, a direction to the police authorities to carry out preliminary investigation is unwarranted particularly when there are provisions under the 1960 Act to handle complaints regarding financial irregularities etc.
3. Issue notice, returnable in six weeks.
4. In the meantime, effect and operation of the impugned order

1 (2014) 2 SCC 1

dated 02.09.2026 shall remain stayed.

5. However, it is clarified that stay of the impugned order shall not preclude the Registrar from exercising his powers under the provisions of the 1960 Act to direct for audit, inquiry, inspection and supervision as per the provisions of Chapter VIII of the 1960 Act.

(CHETAN ARORA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(SAPNA BANSAL)
COURT MASTER (NSH)