

(1)

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

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO.544 OF 2018
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.10193 OF 2016
AND
WRIT PETITION NO.10329 OF 2016**

Sopan s/o Ranju Khandare & ors. ..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & ors. ..RESPONDENTS

Mr A.M. Nagarkar, Advocate holding for Mr B.S. Kudale, Advocate for
petitioners;

Mr S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for respondent no.1;

Mr S.B. Pulkundwar, Advocate for respondents no.2 & 3

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE
AND
MANGESH S. PATIL, JJ.**

DATE : 26th November, 2018

ORAL ORDER:

As learned Counsel Mr Kudale was not available on 24th November, 2018 in this Court and a request was made on his behalf for adjournment, the matter was adjourned.

2. The petitioners' grievance is of non compliance of the order of this Court dated 20th January, 2017. In a bunch of petitions, this Court considering the grievance of the petitioners that their applications/representations/proposals are pending before the authority for

(2)

considerable long time, directed the authority to decide these applications/representations/proposals expeditiously and in any case within a period of twelve weeks from the date of the order.

3. Mr Pulkundwar, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.2 - Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Hingoli submits that in view of the directions of this Court, respondent no.2 decided the applications on the merits of the applications and the order of this Court is complied with. Mr Pulkundwar then invited our attention to the statement made in the affidavit-in-reply at paragraph 5 to submit that there is some delay in decision and respondent no.2 tenders his unconditional apology for th delay.

4. Mr Pulkundwar also invited our attention to the order passed by the Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Hingoli, dated 18th September, 2018 and a copy of the same is placed on record along with the affidavit-in-reply as Exhibit R-1.

5. In view of the fact that the application is decided by respondent no.2 on merits and the claim raised by the petitioners is turned down assigning the reasons in the order, we have no hesitation to say that the order of this Court is complied with. The apology tendered by respondent no.2 for the delay is accepted. The petition, in view of the above facts, is disposed of accordingly. Needless to state that if the petitioners are aggrieved by the decision, they are

(3)

at liberty to challenge the decision by availing remedies under law, if so advised.

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)

(PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.)

amj