

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 670 OF 2015
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 2394 OF 2014**

Dnyandeo Gopinath Shep .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

Shri R. F. Totala, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri P. N. Kutti, A.G.P. for the Respondent No. 1.

Shri Deelip Patil Bankar, Advocate for the Respondent No. 2.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
SANGITRAO S. PATIL, JJ.**

DATE : 19TH APRIL, 2017.

PER COURT :

. We have heard Mr. Totala, the learned counsel for the petitioner. The learned A. G. P. informs that the order passed by this Court in the writ petition is complied in as much as decision on the proposal sent by the Corporation has been taken by the State and the same has been turned down. Mr. Totala, the learned counsel states that, the decision has not been produced on record.

2. The petitioner may get the same from the Corporation or

under the Right to Information Act also. We accept the statement made that, the decision has been taken and the proposal of the Corporation is turned down. Naturally, the respondent/State is bound by the said statement.

3. In view of the said communication, though belatedly the order is complied with. The contempt stands purged. The contempt petition is disposed of. No costs.

4. In case the petitioner is aggrieved by any decision taken, the petitioner is at liberty to take up appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

[SANGITRAO S. PATIL, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

bsb/April 17