

drp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 594 OF 2015
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.2449 OF 2013

Arvind Vishnu Lokhande & Others

PETITIONERS

VERSUS

Bhausahab Thorat, Tahsildar & others

RESPONDENTS

.....

Mr. V. G. Mete, Advocate for the petitioners
Mr. S. N. Kendre, AGP for respondent State

.....

[CORAM : SUNIL P. DESHMUKH, J.]

DATE : 20th OCTOBER, 2015

ORDER :

1. The contempt petition has been moved purportedly aggrieved by endorsement by Circle Inspector in respect of mutation entry bearing No.1819.

2. It is the contention of the petitioners that since the order of *status quo* which had been operating till 27th August, 2014 had not been continued by this court, the original order passed by sub-ordinate authority stands restored and accordingly mutation ought to have been recorded. He submits that, however, though the Talathi had taken on record mutations,

mutation entry No.1819 has been endorsed under order dated 30th December, 2014 of the Circle Inspector, does not carry full purport underlying non continuation of *status quo* order by this court. He, as such, claims that it tantamounts to contempt.

3. It appears that after the interim relief was refused to be continued, mutation has taken place, the endorsement according to learned advocate for the petitioners, is short of fulfilling the purpose.

4. It emerges that there is no direction of this court, which was required to be followed by the authorities and the endorsement made on some considerations by the Circle Inspector, is sought be questioned. Endorsement of Circle Inspector, if any, if thought not to be in the interest of the petitioner, it cannot be said that it is contempt or contemptuous act.

5. Contempt petition as such, does not survive and stands rejected.

6. Observations made hereinbefore are for the purpose of rejection of the contempt petition and have no efficacy any further and would not be an impediment if the petitioners choose

to avail of remedy available by the acts, by which the petitioners claim to have been aggrieved.

[SUNIL P. DESHMUKH, J.]

drp/cp594-14