

Vidya Amin

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 60 OF 2013

Smt. Prerna Chandrashekhar Kubal ... Petitioner
Vs.
Daisy Dadarkar, The Chairman & Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. Javed Hussein a/w. Mr. S.S. Lotankar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. N.G. Helelkar, Advocate for respondent nos. 1 and 2.
Mr. A.R. Matkari, AGP for respondent no. 3.

CORAM: MRS.MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.
DATE : 29th SEPTEMBER, 2015

P.C.:

This Contempt Petition is filed by the petitioner, as there was a breach of the order dated 7th February, 2012 passed by the School Tribunal directing that the petitioner be reinstated and she be paid backwages.

2. The learned counsel for respondent nos. 1 and 2 submitted that the said order of School Tribunal was challenged by the respondents in Civil Writ Petition No. 3839 of 2013 and the said Writ Petition was disposed of by this Court by an order dated 26th June, 2014. He relied on paragraphs 7 and 8 of the said order and pointed out that the petitioner was reinstated and therefore the Court observed that no further dispute exists between the management and petitioner so also she was allowed to withdraw the amount of backwages and it was observed that the present petitioner shall

not pursue the Contempt Petition.

3. In view of this, Contempt Petition is disposed of.

4. However, the learned for the petitioner informs the Court that respondents/School Tribunal have not complied with the order of this Court dated 26th June, 2014 and though the petitioner is reinstated, the respondents/contemnors are not paying her salary.

5. The petitioner's grievance may be valid, however, the said grievance cannot be agitated in this Contempt Petition, that may give rise to another cause of action. It is necessary for the contemnors to obey the order of this Court.

(MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.)

CERTIFICATE

Certified to be true and correct copy of the original signed
Judgment/Order.