

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE, BENCH AT AURANGABAD

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

Court's or Judge's orders

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.736 OF 2015
IN WP/6704/2015

RAJAN MARUTI KAMBLE

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr.Bide

Dnyaneshwar A

AGP for Respondents/State: Mr.S.B.

Yawalkar.

Advocate for Respondent 3: Mr.Goyanka M.K.

...

CORAM:S.S.SHINDE & SANGITRAO S. PATIL, JJ.

Dated: MAY 02, 2016

...

Heard.

2 In pursuance to the notices issued to respondents, respondent No.3 has filed affidavit-in-reply. In paragraph 5 of the said reply, it is stated that the representation of the petitioner has been decided and accordingly the petitioner has been informed by letter dated 11th April, 2016. In para a6 of the affidavit, respondent No.3 has tendered unconditional

apology.

3 It is true that the representation has not been decided within six weeks as directed by this Court by order dated 1st September, 2015 in Writ Petition No.6704 of 2015. However, respondent No.3 has tendered unconditional apology for that.

4 The Supreme Court in case of **Suresh Chandra Poddar vs. Dhani Ram and others [(2002) 1 SCC 766]** has taken a view that even where the order of court is complied with, subsequent to receipt of notice of contempt, court should show judicial grace and magnanimity in dealing with action for contempt.

5 In that view of the matter, contempt petition stands disposed of.

(SANGITRAO S.PATIL, J) (S.S. SHINDE, J)