

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 614 OF 2015
IN WP/9985/2014**

(Sangmeshwar Piraji Kandurke and ors. Vs. Ujjawal
Ukke and ors.)

--

Mr.A.V.Indrale-Patil, advocate for petitioner

Mrs.A.V.Gondhalekar, AGP for respondents – State

--

**CORAM : S.S. SHINDE AND
SANGITRAO S. PATIL, JJ.**

DATE : APRIL 07, 2016

PER COURT :

Heard.

2] The direction/order of which disobedience has been alleged in this Contempt Petition is complied with by the Respondent. However, there is delay in compliance. The Respondent for that purpose have tendered unconditional apology.

3] The Supreme Court in the case of **Suresh Chandra Poddar Vs. Dhani Ram and others** reported in (2002) 1 SCC 766 held that,

"Time and again this Court has cautioned as to when and in what circumstances contempt of court jurisdiction is to be exercised. Such a power is not intended to be exercised as a matter of course. Courts should not feel unduly touchy when they are told that the orders have not been implemented forthwith. If the court is told that the direction or the order of the court has been complied with subsequently, albeit after receipt of notice of contempt, we expect the courts to show judicial grace and magnanimity in dealing with the action for contempt."

4] In the light of discussion hereinabove, in our opinion, ends of justice would meet if the unconditional apology tendered by the cotemnor is accepted and contempt proceedings are dropped.

5] Accordingly we accept the unconditional and unqualified apology. Contempt proceedings stands dropped. The notice stands discharged.

6] The Contempt Petition stands disposed of.

[SANGITRAO S. PATIL, J.]

[S.S. SHINDE, J.]

kbp