

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONT. PETITION NO. 367 OF 2014
IN WP/9176/2013

BALASAHEB RAMRAO @ RAMKRISHNA GOLE
VERSUS
VITTHALRAO YASHWANTRAO BIRADAR AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Bora Satyajit S.
AGP for Respondents: Ms. S.A. Dhumal
.....

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

DATED : 10th JUNE, 2015

P.C. :-

1. Mr. Bora, the learned counsel for the petitioner states that this court vide order dated 14.2.2014 directed the respondents to decide the representation of the petitioner within three months. However, the same is not decided within that particular time. An amount of Rs.14,580/- was given by cheque dated 4.4.2014 and an amount of Rs.55,049/- was given by cheque dated 29.5.2015, the same is not towards the total payment. The amount claimed was more than Rs.90,000/- as per the representation and hardly an amount of Rs.70,000/- is paid. The same is not full compliance of the order of this court.

2. The learned A.G.P. submits that the amount which was due

and payable to the petitioner is in respect of travelling allowance.

3. This Court had not directed to pay the particular amount but had directed to decide the representation. The representation is not decided within stipulated period, however, payment of Rs.70,000/- is made pursuant to the claim made by the petitioner in the representation.

4. As the order of deciding representation indirectly has been complied, though belatedly, the contempt stands purged.

5. If the petitioner has grievance with regard to quantum of the receipt of amount and the interest, the petitioner is at liberty to avail the necessary available remedy. Contempt petition, as such, stands disposed of. No costs.

(V. K. JADHAV, J.)

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.)

rlj/