

“ I say and submit here that the contents in Para 8

are incorrect that Respondents are passing onus of decision of proposal on each other. Right from the beginning of the case, the Respondent No.1 has taken a consistent stand that it is responsibility of Respondent No.2 to give benefits of Government Resolution dated 10.7.1974, if extended to the daily wages workers engaged on water supply schemes. Respondent No.1 has never accepted the financial responsibility of the State (in this case the Respondent No.1).”

2. The learned AGP has drawn our attention to the communication addressed to Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Kolhapur by the Desk Officer, Maharashtra State dated 18th June, 2014. This communication has been made after the Division Bench of this Court (A.S.Oka and S.C. Gupte, JJ) passed order on 3rd December, 2013 in a batch of Letters Patent Appeals being LPA No.261/2002 and others.

3. In this view of the matter, the petitioner may resort to appropriate remedy as may be available in law. At this stage, the

learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the petition. Leave is granted.

4. The Contempt Petition stands disposed of as withdrawn.

(G.S.KULKARNI, J)

(NARESH H. PATIL, J.)

L.S. Panjwani, P.S.