

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

**CONT. PETITION NO. 473 OF 2015
IN WP/9311/2014**

**NAZMA BEGUM RASHEED KHAN
VERSUS
NIDHA GADGIL AND OTHERS**

Mr. Choudhari Md. Mujeebuddin Ms., Advocate for petitioner.

Mr.S.R. Yadav, AGP for respondents.

**CORAM : S.S. SHINDE &
P.R. BORA, JJ.
DATED : 22.12.2015**

P.C. :-

1. Heard. We have considered the submissions of learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned AGP for the respondent/State. Perused order of which disobedience has been alleged as well as decision taken by respondent No.2. It is contention of learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner that the decision taken by respondent No.2 is contrary to the service record of father of the petitioner. Learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the decision of respondent No.2 is not based upon correct facts and therefore the respondents may be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act and Article 215 of the Constitution of India.

2. On the other hand, learned AGP submits that in pursuance of directions issued by this Court, the petitioner did file representation. The representation has been decided. In case, the petitioner is aggrieved, he is at liberty to assail said decision. However, there is no willful disobedience as such by the respondents.

3. We have heard learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as learned AGP for the respondents. Upon perusal of the affidavit in reply and decision taken by respondent No.2, the directions are complied in as much as the representation has been decided. If the petitioner has grievance about the decision taken by respondent No.2, the petitioner can seek appropriate remedy as available in law by raising all available contentions.

4. The contempt petition stands disposed of.

[P.R. BORA, J.]

[S.S. SHINDE, J.]