IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.480 OF 2019
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.4415 OF 2016

(Nawab Sajjad Hussain Mohammad Iqbal Vs Ravi Mittal and others)

Mr.A.G.Kanade – Advocate for Petitioner
Mr.S.V.Warad – Advocate for Respondent No.2
Mr.K.B.Deshpande – Advocate for Respondent No.3

CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE
AND
ANIL S. KILOR, JJ.

DATE : 04th November, 2019

ORDER :-

By our order dated 05th August, 2019, simple notice was issued to respondent Nos.2 and 3 only on a grievance that in-spite of the order of this Court dated 06th January, 2017, the respondent-bank failed to take any decision on the representation of the petitioner.

2. Mr.Warad, learned Counsel appearing for

respondent No.2 - Zonal Manager, Central Bank of India, Osmanpura, Aurangabad, Dist. Aurangabad and Mr.K.B.Deshpande, learned Counsel appearing for respondent No.3 - Mr.Santosh Kamble, Branch Manager, Central Bank of India Supa Branch, At Post Supa, Tq.Parner, Dist.Ahmednagar submitted before this Court that the order of this Court is duly complied with. The documents are also placed on record in support of submission i.e. the communication dated 07th September, 2019 to the petitioner Nawab Sajjid Hussain Mohammad and the communication dated 07th September, 2019 to the Tahsildar, Nipani, Tq.Nipani, Dist Belgavi, Karnataka. The documents are taken on record and marked as "X" collectively for identification purpose.

3. Perusal of the document dated 07th September, 2019 issued to the petitioner shows that the same is received by the petitioner, as an endorsement is made on the communication under the signature of the petitioner Nawab Sajjid Hussain Mohammad. The communication dated 07th September, 2019 to the Tahsildar also states that the respondent-bank had full

and final settlement under One Time Settlement scheme with the borrower company and the bank has no dues pending on the said company as on date and the bank further requested the Tahsildar to release the charge of the bank on the captioned immovable property.

4. In view of above communication, it can safely be said that the respondent-Central Bank of India had taken a decision and it is also communicated to the petitioner. As the order of this Court is duly complied with and the purpose of approaching this Court is now duly served, the Contempt Petition is accordingly disposed of.

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.) **(PRASANNA B VARALE, J.)**

SST