



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

**912 CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 278 OF 2013
IN WP/6102/2011**

CHANDRABHAN SHAMRAO AGALE

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

.....

None for the petitioner.

Adv. A. S. Shinde, AGP for Respondents-State

.....

**CORAM : SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE AND
VAISHALI PATIL-JADHAV, JJ.**

DATED : 27/08/2026

Per Court:

. None for the petitioner.

2. Notices were issued in this petition in the year 2013, which remained unserved, as the respondent No.2 was transferred to Kannad. Thereafter, no steps have been taken in this contempt petition.

3. By way of order under contempt, the rental compensation was to be determined by the respondent No. 2. The learned AGP states that the demand was raised on 18.06.2013 with the Deputy Commissioner, AGS, Aurangabad. The petitioner has not circulated the petition thereafter. By this time, the order under contempt must have been complied with and petitioner must have received rental compensation.

4. In view of the same, it seems that the petitioner is not interested in prosecuting the contempt. Hence, the contempt petition stands disposed of for non prosecution.

(VAISHALI PATIL-JADHAV, J.) (SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.)

shivani/