

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

**CIVIL APPLICATION NO.13761 OF 2019
IN
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.682 OF 2018
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.5214 OF 2017**

Pandurang S/o Uttamrao Avhad
Age:54 Years, Occu.Service,
R/o Savatanagar, Shevgaon Raod,
Pathardi, Dist. Ahmednagar

APPLICANT

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

RESPONDENTS

Mr A.G. Ambedkar, Advocate for the applicant;
Mrs M.A. Deshpande, A.G.P. for respondent-State;
Mr Naiknaware, Advocate for respondent No.6

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE &
ANIL S. KILOR, JJ.**

DATED : 26th NOVEMBER, 2019

ORAL ORDER:

The present application seeking intervention in the contempt petition runs around ten pages and the entire attempt is to show that certain facts were not

brought before this Court while disposing the Writ Petition No. 5214 of 2017. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that an application for intervention was also filed during the pendency of Writ Petition No. 5214 of 2017. Certain allegations are also levelled against respondent No. 7. The application raising such grounds cannot be entertained in the contempt petition.

2. The applicant, if having any grievance, either against the order passed by the local authorities or any exercise undertaken by the authorities, he is at liberty to present an independent petition with appropriate prayers. We cannot extend the scope of contempt petition permitting the applicant to intervene in the contempt petition.

3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant had filed writ petition. The order of the Division Bench is also placed on record. The perusal of the order only shows that the petitioner submitted before

this Court that he had filed representations before the authorities and those representations are pending without any decision by the authorities. Considering this fact, the Division Bench disposed of the writ petition filed by the petitioner directing the authority to decide the representations within stipulated period. Even accepting this position, same would not permit us to allow the intervention application.

4. Considering all these facts, we are of the clear opinion that the application is thoroughly meritless and deserves to be dismissed at threshold and same is accordingly dismissed.

[ANIL S. KILOR, J.]

[PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.]