

(1)

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

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO.636 OF 2017
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.7565 OF 2008**

Maroti s/o Chandoji Gaikwad,
Age: 46 years, Occu: Nil,
R/o: Hadoli (J), Taluka : Loha,
Dist. Nanded

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra,
through it's Secretary,
Rural Development Department
M. S. Department & ors.

..RESPONDENTS

Mr R. I. Wakode, Advocate for petitioner;
Mr A. R. Kale, A.G.P. for respondent/State;
Mr N. S. Kadam, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 & 3

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE
AND
MANISH PITALE, JJ.**

DATE : 21st August, 2018

ORAL ORDER:

Heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

2. The petitioner submits that respondents have willfully disobeyed the order of this Court. Perused the order dated 25th July, 2018, passed by this Court. Taking note of the submission that the respondents have approached the Hon'ble the Apex Court by filing a Special Leave Petition, the Division Bench of this Court granted four weeks time as a last chance.

(2)

3. It is brought to our notice that review application was also filed challenging the order passed in writ petition and review application was dismissed by this Court.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner invited our attention to the order passed by the Hon'ble the Apex Court on 3rd August, 2018. The Hon'ble the Apex Court found no reason to entertain the Special Leave Petition and same was dismissed. The Hon'ble the Apex Court further directed that the impugned judgment and order shall be implemented in four weeks.

5. Learned Counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3 i.e. Mr Ashok Ambadas Shingare is presently working as a Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Nanded and Mr Shivaji Munjaji Pawar is presently working as Member Secretary & District Animal Husbandry Officer, Zilla Parishad, Nanded submits that the order of this Court as well as the directions of the Hon'ble the Apex Court would be complied with, within a period of two weeks.

6. Respondent No.3 is personally present before this Court and on instructions received from him, the above referred statement is made before this Court.

(3)

7. In view of the statement referred to above made in this Court on behalf of respondent Nos.2 and 3, the grievance of the petitioner is redressed and nothing remains in the contempt petition. As such, the contempt petition is disposed of accordingly.

(MANISH PITALE, J.)

(PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.)

sjk