

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONT. PETITION NO. 220 OF 2014
IN CRI. WP/125/2013

ALISHAN BEE SHAIKH RASHID
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Khandagale Patil P. P.
AGP for Respondents: Mr. S.P. Deshmukh
.....

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
V. K. JADHAV, JJ.**

DATED : 7th DECEMBER, 2015

P.C. :-

1. Mr. Khandagale, the learned counsel for the petitioner states that this Court had passed an order on 2.8.2013 in criminal writ petition No. 125 of 2013 whereby this Court directed the Superintendent of Police to pass appropriate orders on the representation made by the present petitioner. The respondent did not pass order, as such present contempt petition is filed. Learned counsel submits that the report at Exh. R-1 is not correct one, it does not depict true and correct state of affairs. The petitioner has lost her son. According to the learned counsel, the respondents ought to have registered the crime against the accused persons.

2. Learned A.P.P. submits that the Deputy Commissioner of

Police has conducted enquiry and he has submitted report on 6.3.2014 wherein he has made enquiry/investigation and as per the same, death of son of the petitioner does not appear to be homicidal death. The petitioner has also accepted the amount of Rs.75,000/- on account of accidental death.

3. We have considered the submissions. This being the contempt petition, we cannot go into the merits and de-merits of the report given. In the present contempt petition, we would be concerned with the compliance and the order passed. The order seems to have been complied by conducting necessary enquiry on the representation of the petitioner. If the petitioner is not satisfied with the report, the petitioner is at liberty to take further steps as would be permissible in law. As the order is complied with, the contempt petition is disposed of. No costs.

(V. K. JADHAV, J.)

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.)

rlj/