

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

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 571 OF 2019
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.12067 OF 2018**

M/s Sarjan Realities Limited
Through
Shri Avinash Rajaram Nalawade,
Age: 45 years, Occ: Service,
5th Floor, Godrej Millenium, 9,
Koregaon Park, Pune 411 001

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Bhimraj Darade,
Age: Major, Occ: Govt. service as
The Sub Divisional Officer,
Dhule Division, Dhule,
Administrative Complex,
Old Collector Office, Dhule
District Dhule
2. Kishor Kadam,
Age: Major, Occ: Govt. service as
The Tahsildar, Dhule
Tal. Dhule, Dist. Dhule
3. Sandip Bhosale
Age: Major, Occ: Govt. service as
The Tehsildar, Sakri
Tehsil Office, Tal. Sakri,
Dist. Dhule

RESPONDENTS

Mr Shrikrishna Ganbawale, Advocate i/b Mr Amol R. Joshi,
Advocate for petitioner;
Mr K.S. Patil, A.G.P. for respondent/State

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

DATED : 30th AUGUST, 2019

ORAL ORDER:

Heard learned Counsel appearing for the
petitioner.

2. The petitioner is before this Court with a grievance that the respondents have committed an act of contempt of this Court by non complying the order of the Divisional Commissioner, Nashik dated 5th February, 2019 passed in pursuance of the order of this Court dated 24th November, 2018, 22nd December, 2018 in Civil Application No.13730 of 2018 in Writ Petition No. 12067 of 2018.

3. On perusal of these orders, we are of the clear opinion that the present contempt petition is devoid of

any merit and is based upon only an assumption and presumption of the petitioner that the respondents have committed an act of willful disobedience of the order of this court. The petition was adjourned at the request of learned Counsel for the petitioner for seeking instructions.

4. Today, learned Counsel presented before us a communication/submission of Naib Tahsildar (Revenue), for and on behalf of Tahshildar, Sakri before the Honorable State Minister (Revenue) in a proceeding initiated by one Mr. Hemmat Madhavrao Lonari and others claiming to be appellants in the Revenue Appeal. It is the submission of learned Counsel for the petitioner that this submission of Tahsildar and more particularly the concluding part of the submission takes care of the grievance of the petitioner. If it is an impression of the petitioner, the petitioner is free and at liberty to carry this impression.

5. At the cost of repetition, we state that this Court was of the opinion that the petition was devoid of any merit so as to entertain the petition. As such, the contempt petition is dismissed.

[AVINASH G. GHAROTE, J.]

[PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.]

Tupe