

Urmila Ingale

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 319 OF 2018

Prakash Laxman Chanderkar	.. Petitioner
Vs.	
Anupam Shrivastava	
Chief Manager of Bank of Baroda	.. Respondent

Mr.Prakash Laxman Chanderkar – Petitioner in-person present.

CORAM : M.S.KARNIK, J.

DATE : 23rd SEPTEMBER 2019

P.C. :

. The petitioner appears in person. By an office report dated 03/03/2018, in view of provisions of Chapter IV -A (ii) of the Bombay High Court Appellate Side Rules, the petitioner was called for interaction. The Committee was of the view that the applicant is not in a position to assist this Court Court effectively in disposal of the present matter. When the matter appeared before this Court today, I asked the contempt petitioner if he wishes to be represented by advocate or by an legal aid. The petitioner insisted that he wants to be heard in person. The petitioner invited my attention to page 25 of the paper-book.

According to him, Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, Dadar had directed Mr. Anupam Shrivastava i.e. respondent who is Chief Manager, Varsova Branch of Bank of Baroda to produce the documents which are mentioned therein. It is the contention of the petitioner that only with a view to protect some of the accused, the documents which are mentioned at page 25 were not produced before the Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate. According to the petitioner, on later date some of the documents were produced but not all the documents. According to the petitioner only 9 documents out of 35 documents are produced.

2. Filing of the present Contempt Petition for non-production of some of the documents before the Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate is completely misconceived. Keeping the liberty of the petitioner open to avail of any other appropriate remedy in accordance with law, present Petition is dismissed.

(M.S.KARNIK, J.)