

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

**920 CIVIL APPLICATION NO.2127 OF 2018
IN CP/335/2017**

**NANDA MURLIDHAR DESHMUKH
VERSUS
SUBHASH BHIKAN PATIL AND ANOTHER**

...

Advocate for Applicant : Shri S.V. Jadhav
Advocate for Respondents : Shri V.D. Salunke

...

WITH

**CIVIL APPLICATION NO.14697 OF 2017
IN CP/335/2017 WITH CP/869/2018 IN CP/335/2017 WITH
CA/344/2019 IN CP/335/2017**

.....

**CORAM : P.R. BORA, J.
Dated: June 07, 2019**

PER COURT :-

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the applicant and the learned Counsel for the respondents.

2. The applicant has preferred the aforesaid contempt petition alleging that, the respondents have not complied with the order passed by this Court on 06.02.2017 in Writ Petition No.9903 of 2016. In the said contempt petition, the respondents have filed the elaborate reply. The contentions as are raised in the contempt petition are seriously disputed by the respondents.

During pendency of the aforesaid contempt petition, the present application has been filed by the applicant seeking the following directions :

'(B) To direct the respondent to pay the back wages as per order dated 6/1/2017 passed by this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition No.9903/2016, as total amount of Rs.23,81,174/- with 12% interest thereon from the date of order of this Hon'ble Court to date of reinstatement.'

3. The respondents have filed a reply to the present application denying and disputing the calculations of the arrears of wages as are made by the applicant - petitioner. It is submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the respondents that, the respondents are ready to proceed with the hearing of the contempt petition. It appears to me that, if the contempt petition is finally heard, the matter can be finally decided.

4. In view of the fact that the calculations as are made by the applicant are seriously disputed, even otherwise it is difficult to pass any other order on the present application. In the circumstances, Civil Application No.2127 of 2018 stands disposed of.

5. The applicant - petitioner and the respondents are directed to proceed with the contempt petition. The Court has suggested to keep the matter for final disposal after two weeks. The learned Counsel for the applicant - petitioner, however, has prayed for eight weeks time for arguing the matter. It appears that, the learned Counsel for the applicant does not want to argue the contempt petition. In the circumstances, the matter stands adjourned *sine die*.

(**PR. BORA, J.**)

...