

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

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 80 OF 2015

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 4377 OF 2009

AND WRIT PETITION NO. 4026 OF 2011

Suryaprakash Bhawarlal Bhatia & Ors. VERSUS K. T. Charan Mah. State Coop. Krishi Gramin Bank & Ors.

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri Patil counsel for the petitioner.

Shri G. G. Mishra counsel for the respondent nos. 3 to 5.

CORAM : SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK AND
A. S. CHANDURKAR, JJ.

DATE : JANUARY 11, 2016.

By this contempt petition, the petitioners seek action against the respondents for willful disobedience of the order dated 15.03.2012 in a bunch of writ petition including the petitions filed by the petitioners. It is stated that though the respondents were directed to make payment of arrears of dearness allowance to the petitioners within a period of 12 months, the respondent nos. 3 to 5 i. e. the Director of the Yavatmal and Buldhana Zilla Sahakari Krishi Gramin Bahuuddeshiya Vikas Bank did not make the payment. It is stated that the payments have been made by the apex bank and the respondent nos. 3 to 5 have not paid the dues till date.

Shri Bodade, the learned counsel for the respondent no.3 and Shri Mishra, the learned counsel for the

respondent nos. 4 and 5 state that the contempt petitions seeking action against the respondents for the alleged willful disobedience of similar orders were dismissed by this Court by a common order dated 13.12.2013 after holding that the respondents do not appear to have intentionally flouted the order of which the contempt is alleged. It is stated that the contempt petition that stands dismissed by the order dated 13.04.2013 was also in respect of the order dated 15.03.2012, of which the contempt is alleged in this petition.

On hearing the learned counsel for the parties and on a perusal of the order dated 13.12.2012, we do not find that the respondent nos. 3 to 5 have deliberately and intentionally flouted the orders of which the contempt is alleged. Hence, for the reasons recorded in the order dated 13.12.2013 in a bunch of contempt petitions bearing contempt petition no. 115 of 2013 and others, we dismiss this contempt petition with no order as costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

