

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.17 OF 2016
IN
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.2901 OF 2015
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.9088 OF 2011

SURYABHAN VITHOBA AMBHORE

PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA
AND ANOTHER

RESPONDENTS

Mr.R.K.Khandelwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.A.P.Basarkar, AGP for respondent No.1.

Mr.G.G.Suryawanshi, Advocate for respondent No.2.

(CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

DATE : 23/03/2016

PER COURT :

1. The learned AGP points out the communication by the petitioner to the Plantation Officer wherein he has submitted that he is not willing to work on the type of work that has been allotted to him. He would work only if the work as directed by the Court is available.

2. Learned AGP further submits that if the petitioner wants work only under the Planned Scheme, he will have to be deployed at any place wherever such Planned Scheme is being implemented and

provided there is any work available considering the persons who may have already been deployed in the Planned Scheme.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that he is not willing to work on the Employment Guarantee Scheme and is willing to work on any Planned Scheme wherever the work is available.

4. In the light of the statement recorded above, the respondent has shown its willingness to find out whether any work on the Planned Scheme is available and would deploy the petitioner on such a Planned Scheme. The petitioner, however, is not satisfied.

5. I have gone through the letter issued by the respondent dated 05/11/2015 by which an effort has been made to allot work to the petitioner within the Aurangabad District. Said work is made available and the record of the work performed by the petitioner is to be recorded in the Job Card. Such record is to be maintained by the Tahsildar Office at Phulambri. By the said order, the petitioner was deployed on the activity as set out therein.

6. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits on instructions that he is not willing to do the work as is allotted to him by letter

dated 05/11/2015.

7. In the light of the above, prima facie, I do not find that respondent Nos.1 and 2 could be said to have deliberately, intentionally and willfully disobeyed the order passed by this Court dated 16/10/2015.

8. This petition, being devoid of merits, is dismissed.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)