

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION No. 532 OF 2013
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 10589 OF 2012

Balasaheb Bandoba Jadhav. ..Petitioner.
Versus
State of Maharashtra & Others. ..Respondents.

Mr. Vilas B. Tapkir for the Petitioner.
Mr. V. N. Sagare, AGP for the Sttae.

Coram : RANJIT MORE &
SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.
Date : **January 18, 2018.**

P. C. :

1. Heard the learned Counsel appearing for the respective parties. Perused the petition as well as the affidavit-in-reply.
2. The petition is filed complaining non compliance of the order dated 13th December 2012 passed in Writ Petition No. 10589 of 2012. By the said order, this Court had directed Respondent No.2 to consider the Petitioner's representation dated 23rd August 2012 within six weeks. The said order was not complied with and therefore the Petitioner was constrained to approach this Court by way of present contempt petition.
3. One Mr. Uttam Patil, Deputy Collector (Rehabilitation), District Pune has filed affidavit-in-reply. The reply shows that the

Petitioner's representation is decided on 15th January 2018. Copy of the said decision is annexed to the affidavit-in-reply.

4. Evidently, the Petitioner's said representation has not been decided within the time stipulated by this Court. Nevertheless some explanation is given in paragraph 6 of the affidavit. Besides, Mr. Uttam Patil has tendered unconditional apology. In the facts and circumstances of the case we accept the same. Since the Petitioner's representation is decided, though belatedly, we do not wish to proceed further in this contempt petition and the same is disposed of.

5. Needless to state that the Petitioner is always at liberty to challenge the order passed on his representation.

[SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.]

[RANJIT MORE, J.]