

(1)

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

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO.884 OF 2018
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.7670 OF 2015**

1. Yadavrao s/o Sambhaji Chivde,
Age: 65 years, Occu: Agriculture
2. Balaji s/o Gangadharrao Chivde,
Age:43 years, Occu: Agriculture
3. Gangadhar S/o Ramrao Beldare,
Age:55 years, Occu: Agriculture
4. Datta s/o Ankush Deopuje,
Age: 31 years, Occu: Agriculture

All above are R/o. Kurula,
Tq. Kandhar, District Nanded

..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

1. Arun Dongare,
The Collector, Nanded,
Dist. Nanded
2. P. S. Borgaonkar,
The Sub-Divisional Officer,
Kandhar Sub Division, Kandhar,
District Nanded
3. Smt. Aruna Ganeshrao Sangewar,
The Then Tahsildar, Tahsil Office,
Kandhar, Taluka Kandhar,
District Nanded,
Presently working as Tahsildar
at Tahsil Office, Ahmedpur,
Dist. Latur

(2)

4. Smt. Santoshi Sanjay Devkule,
The Tahsildar, Tahsil Office,
Kandhar, Taluka Kandhar,
District Nanded
5. Ashok Shingare,
The Chief Executive Officer,
Zilla Parishad, Nanded,
District Nanded
6. Shri. K. V. Balwant,
The Block Development Officer,
Panchayat Samitee, Kandhar,
Tq. Kandhar, District Nanded

..RESPONDENTS

Mr S. B. Patil, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr S. B. Pulkundwar, Advocate for respondent Nos.5 & 6

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

DATE : 9th October, 2019

ORAL ORDER:

Heard Mr Patil, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners.

2. By an order dated 30th August, 2016, the Division Bench of this Court was pleased to observe that as the respondent No.4 is in the process of the hearing and the hearing had been already commenced, and it is expected that respondent No.4 – authority would conclude the hearing expeditiously and within a stipulated period of six months, the petition was disposed of. The parties were directed to co-operate with

(3)

the authority in the process of hearing. The respondent No.4 was to take a decision on merits of the matter.

3. Mr Patil, learned Counsel for the petitioners placed on record the decision taken by the authority, dated 21st December, 2018, which is taken on record and marked 'X' for identification. By assigning the reasons, the respondent No.4 has arrived at a conclusion. It is submitted by Mr Patil that the decision of the authority is not in consonance with the prayers made in the petition. We are unable to accept this submission for the simple reason that the Division Bench of this Court had directed the authority to take a decision on merits of the matter and accordingly, the authority took a decision by assigning the reasons.

4. In case, the petitioner is having any grievance, he may take appropriate steps in challenge to the decision of the authority, if so advised. As the order of this Court is duly complied with and the purpose of approaching this Court is duly served, the contempt petition is disposed of accordingly.

(AVINASH G. GHAROTE, J.)

(PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.)

sjk