

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.357 OF 2010

Mr.Kisan Rajaram Jadhav	...	Petitioner
versus		
The State of Maharashtra and Ors.	...	Respondents

Mr.Siddesh Pilankar i/b Mr.Uday P.
Warunjikar for the Petitioner.

Mr.M.M.Pable, AGP for Respondent
No.1(State).

Mr.K.P. Shah i/b Mr.Avinash Avhad for
Respondent Nos.4 to 6.

**CORAM :- S. C. DHARMADHIKARI &
R.I.CHAGLA, JJ.**

DATE :- NOVEMBER 8, 2019

P.C. :-

1. Having heard both sides and perusing the order of this Court dated 3rd September, 2007 and the further affidavit, we are of the view that the petition, though styled as a contempt petition, is really one for enforcing the order of this Court. With the contempt proceedings, the petitioner has been successful in securing an appointment. Now, whether the appointment should be reckoned from a particular date or otherwise, as claimed by the petitioner, is not something which can be resolved in contempt jurisdiction. In contempt jurisdiction, this Court cannot

grant substantive or additional relief. The nature of proceedings themselves are indicative of the fact that this jurisdiction is exceptional and to be sparingly used. The contempt petition has served its purpose. It is disposed of accordingly.

2. We clarify that this order does not prevent the petitioner from proceeding with the pending writ petition.

(R.I.CHAGLA, J.)

(S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)