

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

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.235/2015 IN WRIT PETITION NO. 3970/2014 (D)
(VAISHALI SHANKARRAO SHENDE VERSUS CHANDRAKANT GUDEWAR, MUNICIPAL
COMMISSIONER, AMRAVATI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, AMRAVATI)

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri Y.P. Kaslikar, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri S.S. Shingne, counsel for the respondent.

CORAM : SMT.VASANTI A. NAIK AND
V.M. DESHPANDE, JJ.

DATE : APRIL 11, 2016.

By this contempt petition, the petitioner has sought an action against the respondent for willful disobedience of the order dated 10.02.2015 in Writ Petition No.3970 of 2014.

It is the case of the petitioner that despite the specific direction to the respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner within a time frame and pass necessary orders, the respondent has not decided the representation.

Shri Shingne, the learned counsel for the respondent, refers to the affidavit-in-reply filed on behalf of the respondent and states that after hearing the petitioner, the Amravati Municipal Corporation has decided to absorb the petitioner in the Amravati Municipal Corporation but, since the petitioner has joined the services of the Zilla Parishad, Akola, the respondent has sought the permission of the State Project Director of Maharashtra Prathmik Shikshak Parishad, Mumbai for absorption of the petitioner in the Amravati Municipal Corporation. It is stated that the respondent has decided to absorb the petitioner in the services of the Amravati Municipal Corporation but, in the absence of any permission from the concerned authority, the petitioner cannot be actually absorbed.

On hearing the learned counsel for the respondent, we find that the respondent has taken a decision on the representation of the petitioner and has decided to absorb the petitioner in the services of the Amravati Municipal Corporation. Since the respondent has taken a decision in the matter of absorption, we do not find that there is any disobedience of the order of which the contempt is alleged. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the inaction on the part of any other authority, the petitioner is free to take appropriate steps.

In view of the aforesaid, the contempt petition is disposed of with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

APTE