

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.94 OF 2015

IN

CONTEMPT PETITION 134 OF 2014 (D)

IN

WRIT PETITION NO.3926 OF 2001 (P)

Tarachand Panchmaji Tandekar

-vs-

Rupendarsingh, Director, Ground Water Survey Development Agency, Pune

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Mr.N.S.Warulkar, counsel for the petitioner.

CORAM : SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK &
A.M.BADAR, JJ.

DATE : 22.04.2015.

By this contempt petition, the petitioner seeks an action against the respondent under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act for not following the undertaking/ statement made by the learned Government Pleader that the case of the petitioner would be considered in accordance with law after the objections are received.

The petitioner had filed Writ Petition No.3926 of 2001 in which an application was made for a direction to the respondents that the petitioner should be considered for the post of Deputy Engineer (Mechanical) as some other unqualified persons like the petitioner were considered for the said post. This Court granted leave to the petitioner to make appropriate representation to the respondent No.2 in the said writ petition. This Court also directed the respondent No.2 to look into the matter in accordance with law. A

contempt petition was filed by the petitioner bearing Contempt Petition No.134 of 2014, seeking action against the respondent for not deciding the representation. In the said contempt petition, a statement was made by the learned Government Pleader that after receipt of the objections, which would be invited, the case of the petitioner would be considered in accordance with law. The contempt petition was disposed of on the statement made by the learned Government Pleader.

We do not find that any direction is issued by this Court in Contempt Petition No.134 of 2014 to the respondents to decide the representation of the petitioner within a time frame. The petitioner has not filed the contempt petition against the order dated 21/02/2014 in Writ Petition No.3926 of 2001 and has sought action against the respondents for disobedience of the order dated 05/01/2015 in Contempt Petition No.134 of 2014. We do not find that any specific direction is issued to the respondent to decide the representation within a time frame by the order dated 05/01/2015.

The contempt petition is therefore dismissed with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE