

((1))

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

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.587 OF 2018 IN
WRIT PETITION NO.17 OF 2017

Shri Mohan Ramji Ahire, Died L.Rs.
Mahdu s/o Mohan Ahire and others ... PETITIONERS

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and others... RESPONDENTS

.....
Ms Shwetambari Bhingardev, Advocate holding for
Shri G.S. Patil, Advocate for petitioner
Mrs. R.P. Gaur, A.G.P. for State
.....

CORAM: PRASANNA B. VARALE AND
R.G. AVACHAT, JJ.

DATED : 24th JULY, 2019.

ORAL ORDER :

Heard Ms Bhingardev, learned counsel holding for Mr. Ganesh Patil, learned counsel for the petitioner. In response to simple notice issued by this Court on 8/8/2018, an affidavit-in-reply was filed on 20/12/2018 through the Deputy Collector, Land Acquisition, Jaikwadi Project, Aurangabad. It was submitted that, it was expected of respondent No.3, Executive Engineer, Minor Irrigation Division No.1, Aurangabad, being an acquiring agency, was expected to take appropriate steps expeditiously and the deponent shall issue necessary directions to the respondent No.3.

2. Today learned A.G.P, on receiving instructions from Mr.

K.B. Shikhare, Sectional Engineer on behalf of the Executive Engineer, Minor Irrigation Division No.1, Aurangabad, who is personally present in this Court, placed on record a communication dated 24/7/2019, issued through the Executive Engineer, Minor Irrigation Division No.1, Aurangabad to the learned court below i.e. Civil Judge, Senior Division, Aurangabad along with the copy of the cheque and the statement of compensation. Perusal of the communication further shows that, the learned court below is requested to dispose of the matter by disbursing the amount on verification of certain aspects in the matter. The said communication dated 24/7/2019 is taken on record and is marked "X" for identification.

3. It is submitted by learned A.G.P. that the delay caused was due to the administrative and procedural formalities and now the order is duly complied with by depositing the cheque before the competent Civil Court. Considering these facts, we see no reason to keep the petition pending as the purpose is duly served. The Contempt Petition is accordingly disposed of.

(R.G. AVACHAT)
JUDGE

(PRASANNA B. VARALE)
JUDGE