

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.121 OF 2015

IN

WRIT PETITION NO.4454 OF 2014(P).

(KU.USHA DAYARAM KURANJEKAR...VS..PURUSHOTTAM TUKARAM TIDKE & 2 OTH.)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
 appearances, Court's orders of directions
 and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

CORAM : Z.A.HAQ, J.

DATED : SEPTEMBER 21, 2015.

Heard Shri K.V. Bhoskar, learned advocate for the petitioner-employee and Shri P.N. Shende, learned advocate for the respondent Nos.1 and 2-employer.

The grievance of the petitioner is that the directions given by the School Tribunal to reinstate the petitioner in service were not complied inspite of the fact that this Court while admitting the Writ Petition No. 4454 of 2014 has refused to grant stay to the directions regarding the reinstatement of the petitioner in service. It is submitted that now, the petitioner has been reinstated. This Court issued notices to the respondents on 29th April, 2015 but the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 had not put in appearance when the matter was listed on 12th August, 2015 and therefore, this Court passed an order directing issuance of bailable warrant for securing the presence of respondent Nos. 1 and 2 on 14th September, 2015. On 14th September, 2015 the learned advocate appeared for the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 and sought time to file reply. After 14th September, 2015 the petitioner is reinstated.

From the record, I find that the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 avoided to reinstate the petitioner and had not responded to the notice issued by this Court.

Shri Shende, learned advocate for the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 states that the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 had entrusted the papers to his office, however, due to mistake of his clerk the appearance could not be filed and therefore, the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 were not represented on 12th August, 2015.

Still there is no explanation for not reinstating the petitioner after this Court refused to grant stay to the directions regarding reinstatement, on 2nd March, 2015. Though, I do not propose to invoke jurisdiction under the Contempt of Courts Act, the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 shall pay Rs.10,000/- each to the petitioner and produce receipt on the record of this contempt petition till 28th October, 2015.

The contempt petition is **disposed** in the above terms.

JUDGE