

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

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.146/2015 IN WRIT PETITION NOS. 1024/2014, 1514/2014, 1515/2014, 1516/2014, 1517/2014, 1518/2014 AND 1528/2014 (D)
 (NARENDRA GANGADHAR KADU **VERSUS** ANILRAO BHANDARI, THE C.E.O., Z.P., AMRAVATI)
 WITH

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.236/2015 IN WRIT PETITION NO. 1516/2014 (D)
 (SHAILESH RAJABHAU RAUT **VERSUS** SUNIL PATIL, THE C.E.O., Z.P., AMRAVATI)
 WITH

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.277/2015 IN WRIT PETITION NO. 1515/2014 (D)
 (ANITA SUDHIR CHOPADE **VERSUS** SUNIL PATIL, THE C.E.O., Z.P., 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 petitioners.
 Shri D.M. Kale, counsel for the respondents.

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

DATE : APRIL 11, 2016.

Since the issue involved in these contempt petitions is identical and since they arise from the common order passed by this Court, they are heard together and are decided by this common order.

By these contempt petitions, the petitioners had sought an action against the respondents for willful disobedience of the common order dated 10.02.2015 in a bunch of writ petitions including the writ petitions filed by the petitioners. It is the case of the petitioners that though this Court had, by the common order dated 10.02.2015, directed the respondents to decide the representations of the petitioners and issue necessary orders thereon, the respondents have not decided the same. It is stated that though the direction was issued to the respondents to personally hear the petitioners, the petitioners have not been personally heard.

It appears on a perusal of the affidavit-in-reply filed on behalf of the respondents and the order annexed thereto that the respondents have complied with the common order of which the contempt is alleged. We had not directed the respondents to personally hear the petitioners. By an order dated 06.06.2015, the representations of the petitioners have been decided. It is stated in the order dated 06.06.2015 that there are only 82 sanctioned posts with the respondents and 81 of them were filled. It is stated that Ku.Kavita Ughade has been absorbed in the last vacant post. It is further stated that as and when the vacancy arises, the contractual employees like the petitioners would be absorbed as per their turn. It is clear from a reading of the affidavit-in-reply filed on behalf of the respondents that a decision is taken by the respondents on the representations of the petitioners. If the decision is prejudicial to the petitioners, the petitioners can take appropriate steps but, the rendering of a decision that may be adverse to the petitioners would not be a matter of contempt.

In view of the aforesaid, we dispose of the contempt petitions with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

APTE