IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 30 OF 2019
IN
CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 28 OF 2018
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 2283 OF 2013

Darshan Singh Parmar	...	Petitioner
V/s.		
The Union of India and Ors.	...	Respondents
And		
Rajiv Jalota (IAS) and Ors.	...	Co-Respondents /Contemnors

Mr. D.S. Sakhalkar alongwith Mr. Dinesh Mishra I/by Mr. Dinesh Mishra for the Petitioner.

Mr. V.A. Sonpal- Special Counsel a/w. H.B. Takhe AGP for the State.

Mr. Anil Pandhare, Assistant Commissioner of Sales Tax, Court Matter-Unit-IB legal Branch present.

CORAM : M.S. SANKLECHA AND
S.C. GUPTE, JJ.
DATED : 25th July 2019.

P.C. :

1. The learned counsel for the Petitioner in support of this Petition states that the contempt petition is restricted to the Original respondent No.3- The Commissioner of Sales Tax, Mr. Rajiv Jalota (IAS).

2. It is the petitioner's case that the respondent No.3 herein has not complied with the order of this Court dated 7th December 2018 passed in Contempt Writ Petition No. 28 of 2018. In the above order dated 7th December 2018, this Court directed the respondent No. 3 to provide the details of tax appeals and references pending before various authorities or Courts by 15th January 2019. This was in the context of the respondents stating that the award claimed by the petitioner could not be granted as the information provided has not fructified in recovery of taxes as appeals and references were pending under Bombay Sales Tax Act.

3. It is the case of the Petitioner that in spite of aforesaid directions, status of only some of the pending appeals / References was furnished to the Petitioner on 9th January 2019 by the office of the Respondent No.3. However, it is the case of the petitioner that besides six cases that are referred to in letter dated 19th January 2019, there are other matters in respect of which reward is claimed and which are pending before the various authorities and Courts for which no information was furnished by the respondent inspite of the order of this Court dated 7th December 2018.

4. Mr. Sonpal, Special Counsel for Commissioner of Sales Tax states that the Petitioner may write to the Respondent No.2, the list of other matters, which according to him relate to the reward being claimed. Then, Mr. Sonpal, on instructions of Mr. Pandhare, Assistant Commissioner of Sales Tax states that in case, such

communication giving details as above is received, it would be disposed of within a period of ten days from the receipt of said requisition. Mr. Sonpal further states that if petitioner seeks any inspection with regard to specific cases which are subject matter of reward claimed by the Petitioner, the same would be made available to the petitioner on specific request. Statement accepted.

5. In view of the statement made by Mr. Sonpal on behalf of the respondent No.3, nothing survives in the present Contempt Petition.

6. In the above view, Petition stands disposed of.

(S.C. GUPTE, J) **(M.S. SANKLECHA, J)**