

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 249 OF 2014

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 5801 OF 2012 (P)

M/s. Bajaj Aluminum Industries, M.I.D.C., Amravati through Partner Smt. J.P. Bajaj

-vs-

Mr. Chandra, Secretary, Deptt. of Commerce and Industrial Affairs, State of Mah. and others

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

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Mr. A.C.Dharmadhikari, counsel for the petitioner.
Mrs. Bharti Dangre, GP for the respondents.

CORAM : SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK &
MRS. SWAPNA JOSHI, JJ.

DATE : 22.04.2016.

By this contempt petition, the petitioner seeks action against the respondents for willful disobedience of the directions in the order, dated 09/01/2014 in Writ Petition No.5801 of 2012.

It is the case of the petitioner that though this Court had granted interim relief to the petitioner in terms of prayer clause (B) thereby directing the respondents to disburse the interest subsidy amount to the petitioner for the period mentioned in prayer clause (B) and also to continue to pay the same in accordance with law, the respondents have not paid the same.

Mrs. Dangre, the learned Government Pleader for the respondents, states by referring to the affidavit-in-reply filed on behalf of the respondent No.3 that the Government decided to implement the interim order passed by the High Court and the claims of the petitioner were considered. It is stated that the said affidavit was filed on 14/01/2015 and after filing of the affidavit, the claim of the petitioner was processed and the subsidy to the tune of Rs.11,97,680/- is deposited in the account of the petitioner.

On hearing the learned Government Pleader for the respondents, it appears that the directions in the order, dated 09/01/2014 are complied with. There was no direction in the order, dated 09/01/2014 to pay the amount within a particular time. It appears from the affidavit-in-reply filed on behalf of the respondent No.3 that the Government had decided to implement the order and some time was required for processing the claim of the petitioner. Since it is stated on behalf of the respondents that an amount of Rs.11,97,680/- has been deposited in the account of the petitioner, there is no reason to proceed with the contempt proceedings any longer.

Hence, we dispose of the contempt petition with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

KHUNTE