



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 10142 OF 2025

Shivajirao s/o.Hanumantrao Hude,
Age-58 years, Occu.Agri.,
R/o. Uday Colony, Opp. Nanded Naka,
Udgir, Tq. Udgir, Dist-Latur. .. **PETITIONER**

VERSUS

- 1] Divisional Joint Registrar,
Co-operative Societies,
Latur Region, Latur.
- 2] District Deputy Registrar,
Co-op. Societies, Latur,
District-Latur.
- 3] District Deputy Registrar,
Co-op. Societies, Chha. Sambhajinagar,
Dist. Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar.
- 4] Agricultural Produce Market
Committee, Udgir, Tq. Udgir,
District-Latur,
through its Secretary.
- 5] Zunjar s/o. Ganpatrao Patil,
Age-56 years, Occu. Agri.,
R/o. Wadavana, Tq. Udgir,
District-Latur.
- 6] Hanmant s/o. Sopanrao Shelke,
Age-51 years, Occu. Agri.,
R/o. Dongarshelki, Tq. Udgir,
District-Latur.

- 7] Bhivaji s/o.Motiram Chikhle,
Age-61 years, Occu. Agri.,
R/o. Shelhal, Tq.Udgir,
District-Latur.
- 8] Shyamrao s/o. Samrath Dawale,
Age-55 years, Occu. Service,
R/o. Daul, Tq. Udgir,
District-Latur.
- 9] Dnyaneshwar s/o. Vishwambhar Patil,
Age-50 years, Occu. Agri.,
R/o. Davangaon, Tq. Udgir,
District-Latur.
- 10] Balaji s/o. Mhasnaji Devkatte,
Age-56 years, Occu. Agri & Service,
R/o. Dhadaknal, Post-Takali,
Tq. Udgir, District-Latur.
- 11] Padmakar s/o. Manohar Ugile,
Age- 49 years, Occu. Agri.,
R/o. Nalgir, Tq. Udgir,
District-Latur.

.. **RESPONDENTS**

...

Mr.Mahesh Deshmukh, Advocate h/f. Mr.U.L.Momale,
Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.K.B.Jadhavar, AGP for the respondent Nos.1 to 3–State.

Mr.S.S.Gangakhedkar, Advocate for respondent no.4.

Mr.M.P.Tripathi, Advocate for respondent nos. 9 to 11.

Mr.A.N.Irpatgire, Advocate for respondent nos.5 to 7.

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKAR, J.

Reserved on : 10.09.2025

Pronounced on : 26.09.2025

JUDGMENT :

1] The petitioner stands disqualified by the orders of the authorities constituted under the Maharashtra Agricultural Produce Marketing [Development and Regulation] Act, 1963, as being the Chairman and member of the APMC, Udgir. The Authorities constituted disqualified the petitioner as a Chairman and member of APMC under the provisions of Rule 10 (3) for having incurred disqualification under Rule 10 (2) (ii) of the Maharashtra Agricultural Produce Market Committee [Election to Committee] Rules, 2017 [for short 'Rules of 2017']. By the present Writ Petition, the petitioner seeks quashment of impugned order dated 06.09.2024 passed by the respondent no.3 – District Deputy Registrar, Sambhajinagar, disqualifying the petitioner as member of respondent no.4– APMC, Udgir as well as quashment of the impugned order passed by the respondent no.1 – Divisional Joint Registrar, Latur, dated 31.07.2025, dismissing the appeal preferred by the petitioner.

2] The learned counsel for the petitioner has raised before me two fold submissions viz., first being legal submission i.e. power of the District Deputy Registrar to enter into the issue of disqualification of the petitioner under Rule 10 (3) of the Rules of 2017. In this regard, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is representing 'agriculturist' constituency in the market committee, so also, he is the Chairman of the Committee. He further submits that Rule 10 (1) provides that a person shall be disqualified for being chosen as or for being, a member of a Market Committee if he is disqualified under sub-rule (a) to (k) of Rule 10 (1) of the Rules of 2017. Sub-clause (ii) of Rule 10 (2) provides that a person shall not be chosen as a member, representing agriculturists constituency, if his main income is not from agriculture or possesses a traders', commission agents' or broker license or has interest in a joint family or a firm which has a trader's or commission agents' or broker license. He further submits that if a question arises whether a person is being disqualified under sub-rule (1) of Rule 10, such question

has to be decided by the Director within thirty days of its reference under Rule 10 (3) as provided. However, no authority is constituted to adjudicate dispute as regards disqualification mentioned in Rule 10 (2) of 2017 Rules.

3] He further submits that even assuming such a question can be decided by the Director, the State has issued Notification dated 12.02.2020 and the Director's powers under Rule 10 (3) to decide issue under Rule 10 (1) is delegated to the District Deputy Registrar, who is an Authority, sub-ordinate to the Director. But in the notification there is no delegation of power to decide disqualification under Rule 10 (2). As such, he submits that the District Deputy Registrar has no power to decide disqualification incurred under Rule 10 (2).

4] It is further submission of the petitioner that notification dated 12.02.2020 was issued by the State Government in exercising powers under Section 58 of the Act of 1963 whereby powers of Director of Marketing under Rule 10 (3) and 27 of the Rules of 2017 are delegated to

the District Deputy Registrar from the District to decide disqualification and further powers of the State Government under Rule 10 (5) of the Rules of 2017 to decide the appeal are delegated to the concerned Divisional Joint Registrar Co-operative Societies.

5] Relying upon the Notification dated 12.02.2020, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the disqualification incurred under Rule 10 (2) cannot be adjudicated by the District Deputy Registrar as the power of deciding disqualification under Rule 10 (2) is not delegated to the District Deputy Registrar, as such, the District Deputy Registrar cannot decide the disqualification under Rule 10 (2) before whom the complaint is made. As such, the complaint needs to be dismissed.

6] He also submits that the issue as to whether a person is an 'agriculturist' is to be exclusively decided by the 'Director' and the authority of the 'Director' to decide whether a person is an 'agriculturist' cannot be delegated, as section 2 (2) of the Act of 1963 provides that whether a

person is or is not an agriculturist, on reference the 'Director' has to decide the same and his decision on the issue is final.

7] The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that whether a person is an agriculturist and is residing within the area of APMC, the certificate issued by the Talathi would be conclusive proof that the candidate is an agriculturist and is residing in the market area in terms of Rule 21 (4) of the Rules of 2017. In any event if there is any issue whether a person is an agriculturist, the same can only be adjudicated by the Director under Section 2 (2) of the Act of 1963. Second submission is on the factual aspect.

8] As regards legal submission canvassed, it is necessary to note the relevant provisions of the Maharashtra Agricultural Produce Marketing [Development and Regulation] Act, 1963. Section 2 (b) & 2 (k) of the Act of 1963, defines 'agriculturist' and 'director' as under :

2. Definitions :

(1) ...

(b) *“agriculturist” means a person who ordinarily by himself or by hire labour or otherwise is engaged in the production or growth of agricultural produce which has not been processed, but does not include a trader, commission agent, processor or [broker, an employee of Government or of any co-operative society or of a Market Committee, or a partner in trading firm or an industrial concern in or in relation to agricultural produce although such trader, commission agent, processor or broker, an employee of Government or of any co-operative society or of any Market Committee or a partner in trading firm or an industrial concern] may also be engaged in production or growth of agricultural produce;*

(k) *“Director” means a person appointed as the Director of Agricultural Marketing [***] for the State of Maharashtra [and includes any officer or officers empowered by the State Government by notification in the Official Gazette to exercise or perform such of the powers and functions of the Director under the provisions of this Act or rules or bye-laws made hereunder as may be specified in such notification;]*

9] Section 2 (2) of the Act of 1963 provides as under :

(2) *If any question arises whether a person is or is not an agriculturist for the purposes of this Act, the matter shall be referred to the Director, and the decision of the Director thereon shall be final.*

10] Relevant Rules dealing with disqualification are noted below. Rule 10 of the Maharashtra Agricultural Produce Market Committee [Election to Committee] Rules, 2017 is as under :

10. Disqualifications of Committee member:

(1) *A person shall be disqualified for being chosen as*

or for being, a member of a Market Committee,-

(a) if he has been convicted by a Court in India of any offence and sentenced to imprisonment for a term exceeding six months unless such disqualification has been removed by an order of the State Government; or

(b) if he has not attained the age of twenty-one years; or

(c) if he is of unsound mind and stands so declared by a Competent Court; or

(d) if he is an undischarged insolvent; or

(e) if he is a deaf-mute; or

(f) if he has failed to [pay any dues, fees] or charges due to the Market Committee; or

(g) if he is a servant of the Market Committee or of Government or of a Local Authority or holds a license from such Committee other than that of traders, commission agents, hamals or weighmen; or

(h) if he has directly or indirectly or by his partners any share or interest in any contract or employment with or on behalf of or under the Market Committee; or

(i) if he has committed breach of the Act or the rule or bye-laws made thereunder more than once, or

(j) if he has failed to make payments to any seller or his commission agent as required by the Act and rules.

(k) if he is disqualified by the Act or the rules made thereunder.

(2) A person shall not be chosen as a member, -

*(i) representing the trader's constituency, [***] if the license issued to him is cancelled,*

or suspended or not renewed;

(ii) representing agriculturists constituency, if his main income is not from agriculture or possesses a traders', commission agents' or broker license or has interest in a joint family or a firm which has a trader's or commission agents' or broker license.

Explanation. - *For the purpose of this sub-rule, a person shall be deemed to be ordinarily residing in the market area, or he resides in such area for not less than one hundred and eighty days in a calendar year.*

(3) Where any question arises as to whether a person has become subject to any of the disqualification mentioned in sub rule (1), such question shall be decided by the Director within thirty days of its reference. On the decision of the Director or the decision in Appeal, as the case may be, a person who is disqualified shall cease to hold office from the date of the decision by the Director or by the Appellate Authority, as the case may be. The Market Committee shall on receipt of such decision, fill up the vacancy by co-opting a person eligible for being elected as a member as provided under section 18 of the Act.]

(4) No decision on any such question shall be given, unless the member has been given a reasonable opportunity of being heard.

(5) Any person aggrieved by the decision of the Director may, within thirty days from the date on which the decision is communicated to the member, appeal to the State Government.

11]

Rule 21 (4) of the Rules of 2017 is as under:

21. Presentation of nomination paper and requirements for valid nomination :

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)

(4) On presentation of a nomination paper, the Returning Officer shall satisfy himself that the candidate is an agriculturist residing in the market area or as the case may be, a trader and that the name and the number in the list of voters of the [candidate,] proposers and seconders as entered in the nomination paper are the same as entered in the list of voters :

Provided that, the Returning Officer shall permit any clerical or technical error in the nomination paper in regard to the said name or number to be corrected in order to bring them in conformity with the corresponding entries in the list of voters and where necessary, any clerical or printing error in the said entries shall be overlooked.

[Provided further that, in case of election of fifteen agriculturists under clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 13, it shall not be required to verify the name of the candidate from the Voters' list.]

Explanation. - For the purpose of satisfying the Returning Officer that the candidate is an agriculturist, a certificate of the Talathi of the village where the candidate resides to the effect that the person is an agriculturist as defined in clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 2 of the Act, and is residing in the market area shall be produced along with the nomination paper. The certificate shall be conclusive proof that the candidate is an agriculturist and is residing in market area.

12] For ready reference, Notification dated 12.02.2020 is quoted below :

सहकार, पणन व वस्त्रोद्योग विभाग
मादाम कामा रोड, हुतात्मा राजगुरु चौक,
मंत्रालय, विस्तार, मुंबई - 400 032
दिनांक :- 12 फेब्रुवारी, 2020

अधिसूचना

महाराष्ट्र कृषि उत्पन्न पणन (विकास व विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1963

क्रमांक कृपम. 0719/प्र.क.122/21-स. - महाराष्ट्र कृषि उत्पन्न (विकास व विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1963 मधील कलम 58 अन्वये शासनास प्राप्त

असलेल्या अधिकाराचा वापर करून महाराष्ट्र कृषि उत्पन्न बाजार समित्या (समितीची निवडणूक) नियम, 2017 मधिल नियम 10 चे अधिकार रकाना क.(2) मध्ये नमूद अधिका-यांना रकाना क.(3) नुसार त्याच्या नावासमोर दर्शविल्याप्रमाणे प्रदान करण्यात येत आहेत.

सुची

अ.क (1)	अधिकारी / पदनाम (2)	अधिकार (3)
1	जिल्हा उपनिबंधक, सहकारी संस्था	महाराष्ट्र कृषि उत्पन्न बाजार समित्या (समितीची निवडणूक) नियम, 2017 मधिल नियम 10 चा उप नियम 3 चे पणन संचालकांना असलेले अधिकार
2	विभागीय सहनिबंधक, सहकारी संस्था	महाराष्ट्र कृषि उत्पन्न बाजार समित्या (समितीची निवडणूक) नियम, 2017 मधिल नियम 10 चा उप नियम 5 चे राज्य शासनाला असलेले अधिकार

महाराष्ट्राचे राज्यपाल यांच्या आदेशानुसार व नावाने

सही /—
(का. गो. वळवी)
शासनाचे उपसचिव

13] It can be seen from the above quoted provision that an 'agriculturist' is a person who ordinarily by himself or by hire labour or otherwise is engaged in the production or growth of agricultural produce which has not been processed. However, agriculturist would not include a trader, commission agent, processor or broker, an employee of Government or of any co-operative society or of a Market Committee, or a partner in trading firm or an industrial

concern in or in relation to agricultural produce although such trader, commission agent, processor or broker, an employee of Government or of any co-operative society or of any Market Committee or a partner in trading firm or an industrial concern, who may also be engaged in production or growth of agricultural produce.

14] The definition of agriculturist provides that a person who ordinarily by himself or by hire labour or otherwise is engaged in the production or growth of agricultural produce. He may also be engaged in other activities but he should not be a trader, commission agent etc. in relation to agricultural produce as defined above. Section 2 (2) of the Act of 1963 provides that if any issue arises whether a person, who is an agriculturist, the same on reference has to be decided by the Director.

15] Rule 10 of the Rules of 2017 provides that if an agriculturist contest election from 'agriculturists constituency', his main income should be from agriculture. Rule 10 of the Rules of 2017 provides that a person shall

not be chosen as a member representing agriculturists constituency, if his **main** income is not from agriculture or possesses a traders', commission agents' or broker license or has interest in a joint family or a firm which has a trader's or commission agents' or broker license.

16] Thus, a person, who is an agriculturist, can be chosen as representing agriculturist constituency only if his main income is from agriculture and not does incur other disqualification as noted in Section 2 (b) and in Rule 10 (2). A person qualifying as an agriculturists in terms of section 2 (b) of the APMC Act, in order to contest the elections to the Market Committee from agriculturists constituency, as an additional qualification, his main income should also be from agriculture. This is possibly because the legislature contemplates that there should not be any conflict of interest of the person being appointed as member of managing committee of APMC.

17] Rule 21 (4) of the Rules of 2017 provides for presentation of nomination paper and requirements for

valid nomination. It provides that on presentation of a nomination paper, the Returning Officer shall satisfy himself that the candidate is an agriculturist residing in the market area or as the case may be, a trader and that the name and the number in the list of voters of the candidate proposers and seconders as entered in the nomination paper are the same as entered in the list of voters.

18] Explanation to Rule 21 (4) provides that for the purpose of satisfying the Returning Officer that the candidate is an agriculturist, a certificate of the Talathi of the village where the candidate resides to the effect that the person is an agriculturist as defined in clause (b) of subsection (1) of Section 2 of the Act, and is residing in the market area shall be produced along with the nomination paper. The certificate shall be conclusive proof that the candidate is an agriculturist and is residing in market area.

19] Thus, Rule 21 (4) with its explanation provides that the certificate issued by the Talathi that the person is an agriculturist and is residing within the market area

would be conclusive proof that he is an agriculturist and is residing in market area for the purpose of filing of the nomination papers. At that stage, no further enquiry would be contemplated by the Returning Officer.

20] It is stated that there were earlier proceedings in which the petitioner's nomination as an agriculturist residing in the market area has been upheld by the Returning Officer and on an appeal by the Appellate Authority. However, the proceeding at nomination stage is summary in nature and the findings of Returning Officer are not conclusive and are not binding on the Director (in the instant case District Deputy Registrar) at the stage of deciding disqualification under Rule 10 (3) of 2017 Rules.

21] From the definition of 'Director' as provided in Section 2 (k) of the Act of 1963, Director means a person appointed as the Director of Agricultural Marketing for the State of Maharashtra and includes any officer or officers empowered by the State Government by notification in the Official Gazette to exercise or perform such of the powers

and functions of the Director under the provisions of this Act or rules or bye-laws made hereunder as may be specified in such notification. Thus, powers of the Director can be delegated to any other Officer by official notification. In the instant case, powers of the 'Director' to decide disqualification under Rule 10 (3) of 2017 Rules are delegated to the District Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Societies and the Divisional Joint Registrar, Co-operative Societies to exercise powers under Rule 10 (5) by the State in exercise of powers under Section 58 of the Act of 1963 to decide the disqualification under Rule 10 (1) of the Rules of 2017. Thus, the District Deputy Registrar while deciding disqualification under Rule 10 (3) of the Rules of 2017 exercises the power of the Director under Section 2 (2) of the Act of 1963. Thus, the argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner that whether a person is an agriculturist, such issue can only be decided by the Director himself and not by any other authority, in view of Section 2 (2) of the Act of 1963 cannot be accepted as the Director means a person of whom the powers are conferred by State by

notification and includes any Officer.

22] The complainant's case is that the petitioner's income is mainly from other source as such he incurs disqualification in terms of Rule 10 (2) of the Rules of 2017. Rule 10 (2) of the Rules of 2017 provides for disqualification for being elected as a member of the traders constituency as well as agriculturists constituency. Rule 10 (1) of the Rules of 2017 provides that a person shall be disqualified for "being chosen as" or 'for being' a member of the market committee if he is disqualified by the Act or the rules made thereunder (sub-rule k). Rule 10 (2) provides for disqualification and such a disqualification can be enquired into by the Director under Rule 10 (3). It is to be seen that powers under Rule 10 (1) of the Director are delegated to the District Deputy Registrar and as such submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the disqualification incurred under Rule 10 (2) cannot be enquired into by the District Deputy Registrar under Rule 10 (3), is not a valid submission and is turned down. Rule

10 (1) (k) provides for the disqualification incurred under the Act and Rules. Thus, the disqualification incurred under Rule 10 (2) (ii) falls within the ambit of Rule 10 (1) (k) and as such can be adjudicated under Rule 10 (3). Thus the District Deputy Registrar in terms of Notification dated 12.02.2020 can decide disqualification prescribed under Rule 10 (2).

23] Thus, from the above discussion, it follows that the District Deputy Registrar in pursuance of the Notification issued by the State dated 12.02.2020 under Section 58 of the Act of 1963 can decide the issue whether person is an 'agriculturist' as he is conferred with the powers as of the Director, so also, the District Deputy Registrar can decide issue of disqualification as emanating from Rule 10 (2) of the Rules of 2017.

24] Now coming to the factual issues raised. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the authorities constituted has held that the petitioner is an agriculturist whose main income is from other source as he

has the interest in firm Sachin Protein Ltd. The District Deputy Registrar held the petitioner to be associated with Sachin Food Ltd., Sachin Proteins Ltd., so also, Sachin Dal. On an appeal being filed by the petitioner, the appellate authority (Divisional Joint Registrar) has held that the petitioner has no connection with Sachin Agro Ltd., however, the Appellate Authority (Divisional Joint Registrar) has held that the petitioner is connected with Sachin Proteins Ltd. It is also held that the petitioner's income is substantial from non-agricultural or that his income is from other than agricultural. The authority relied upon the income tax returns of the petitioner for the year 2020-2021, 2021-22 and 2022-23 and has held that the petitioner's income is from a non-agricultural as such on these two grounds the petitioner is disqualified i.e. being associated with Sachin Proteins Ltd. and his main income is from sources other than agriculture for the preceding 3 years.

25] The learned counsel for the petitioner has taken

me through the complaint. He primarily submits that from the complaint it is seen that the only allegation levelled against the petitioner is that he is the partner of Sachin Agro Foods LLP and has a trading licence in his name. It is also stated that the petitioner has interest in firms like Sachin Dal, Sachin Agro Foods Ltd. and is not an agriculturists as defined under Section 2 (1) (b) of the Act, 1963. It is also alleged that the petitioner holds a plot no.35 in the APMC and he runs a business on the said plot and, as such, his interest would run counter to the interest of APMC. Accordingly, the application was made to disqualify the petitioner from the post of the Chairman and for being the member of the committee of respondent no.6. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on reply being given and the matter being contested being District Deputy Registrar has held that the petitioner is associated with Sachin Agro Foods and Sachin Proteins Ltd. However, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as regards Sachin Agro Foods is concerned, the appellate authority has held in his favour that he is not associated

with it. As regards Sachin Proteins Ltd. is concerned there is no pleadings that he is associated with it. As such, there was no occasion for him to respond to the same. However, the District Deputy Registrar has suo-motu based on certain documents produced in the course of argument presented before it has relied upon the same and rendered a finding that the petitioner is associated in Sachin Proteins. The appellate authority while examining the association of the petitioner with Sachin Protein has held that there is no response given by the petitioner to the allegations to his interest in Sachin Proteins and, although there is no complain in that regard the authority concerned has suo-motu looked into it on the basis of documents produced and rendered a finding thereon.

26] The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that such powers are not in existence with the adjudicatory authority. Disqualification being a serious matter specific notice ought to have been given to the petitioner that he is associated with Sachin Proteins Ltd. and that he would have

responded to the same as he has responded in cases of other firms. He submits that he is no more member of the joint family that there is a partition deed executed by the family and that the petitioner is excluded from the firms of joint family and the petitioner is holding only agricultural assets and his income is from agricultural sources. As regards the income tax return, it indicates income earned from other sources which was at prior point of time. There were commercial firms and business. However, agricultural income is not reflected in the documents produced. He has placed on record the audited income particularly he has placed the CA certificate and submits that his income is more from agriculture. As such, he submits that on both counts i.e. the petitioner is associated with Sachin Proteins, so also, his income arising out of other sources other than agricultural, on both these aspects the appellate authority (Divisional Joint Registrar) so also the original authority (District Deputy Registrar) has erroneously held against the petitioner.

27] The learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the judgment in the case of **Pravin Laxman Lokhande V/s. Divisional Joint Registrar and others** in Writ Petition No.7385/2025, decided on 15.07.2025 and submits that administrative action has to be based on strong and impeccable material and cannot be founded on probabilities. He relies upon the judgment in the case of **M. Chinnasamy Vs. K.C. Palanisamy and others** reported in **[2004] 6 SCC 341** and submits that evidence ought not to be accepted when there are no particulars provided. He further relies upon the judgment in the case of **Messrs. Trojan and Co. Vs. RM.N.N.Nagappa Chettiar**) reported in **AIR 1953 SC 235** and submits that the decision of a case cannot be based on grounds outside the pleadings of the parties and it is the case pleaded that has to be found. Without an amendment, the Court was not entitled to grant the relief not asked for. He further relies upon the judgment in the case of **National Textile Corporation Ltd. Vs. Nareshkumar Badrikumar Jagad and others** reported in **AIR 2012 SC 264** and submits that as a rule relief not

founded on the pleadings should not be granted. A decision of a case cannot be based on ground outside the pleadings of the parties. He also relies upon the judgment in the case of **Sadashiv H.Patil Vs. Vithal D. Teke and others** reported in **[2000] 8 SCC 82** and submits that principle-looking at the penal consequences flowing from an elected councillor being subjected to disqualification and its repercussion on the functioning of the local body as also the city or township governed by the local body the provisions have to be construed strictly. A rigorous compliance with the provisions of the Act and the Rules must be shown to have taken place while dealing with a reference under the Act.

28] Considering that the petitioner did not get an opportunity to effectively deal with the allegation of his association with Sachin Proteins as the same were not pleaded in the complaint and also considering that entire audit returns of the petitioner were not with the authorities, the impugned orders are set aside and the matter is remitted back to the respondent no.3 – District Deputy

Registrar to decide whether the petitioner has interest in Sachin Proteins Ltd. and also whether his main income is from non-agriculture within a period of two months from the date of production of this order. The authorities may also decide other issues that may arise before it.

29] Parties to appear before the District Deputy Registrar on 06.10.2025 so as to enable them to fix further dates in the matter.

30] With the above observations, the Writ Petition is disposed of.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER]
JUDGE

DDC