

(1)

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

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO.582 OF 2019
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.1878 OF 2018**

Bhagubai Arjun Bhos,
Age: Major, Occu: Household & Business,
R/o: Andharwadi,
Tq. & District Hingoli ..PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through Principal Secretary,
Food Civil Supply and Consumer Protection
Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai
2. Gajanan Shinde,
Age: Major, Occu: Service as Tahsildar,
Hingoli, R/o.: Tahsil Office, Hingoli,
Tq. & District Hingoli ..RESPONDENTS

Mr S. G. Jadhavar, Advocate for petitioner;
Mrs M. A. Deshpande, A.G.P. for respondent No.1

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE
AND
AVINASH G. GHAROTE, JJ.**

DATE : 11th September, 2019

ORAL ORDER:

Heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner.

(2)

2. In response to notice, respondent No.2 – Shri. Gajanan Sambhajirao Shinde, Tahsildar, Hingoli himself is present in this Court and made available a communication dated 7th September, 2019. This communication is from the Store Keeper, Hingoli to the Tahsildar, Hingoli.

3. Learned Asstt. Govt. Pleader, on instructions, submitted that only for a month of July, there was reduction in quota of the petitioner and this reduction is caused due to some technical difficulty. It was further submitted that as the exercise of updating data entry was going on, the reduction is caused and the reduction was purely unintentional and due to technical difficulty. Learned Asstt. Govt. Pleader then submitted that for months of August and September, regular quota is distributed to the petitioner and the communication dated 7th September, 2019 refers to regular quota being allotted to the petitioner. A copy of the communication dated 7th September, 2019 is taken on record and marked 'X' for identification.

4. A statement is made before this Court on behalf of respondent No.2, who is present in this Court that henceforth there shall no reduction in quota to be allotted to the petitioner.

(3)

5. Considering the above referred fact, in our opinion, the reduction for a short period i.e. for one month was not a willful act to show disregard to the order of this Court, but it was only an unintentional act caused due to certain technical difficulty. Accordingly, as the purpose of approaching this Court is duly served, the petition is disposed of.

(AVINASH G. GHAROTE, J.)

(PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.)

sjk