

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.500 OF 2013

IN

WRIT PETITION NO.6563 OF 2012

Mahatma Phule Pratisthan

.... Petitioner

Vs.

Smt. Vidya Shinde & Others

.... Respondents

Mr. I.M. Khairdi for the Petitioner.
Ms Neha Bhide, 'B' Panel Counsel for the
Respondent-State.

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

DATE : FEBRUARY 03, 2020

P.C:

1. Having heard Mr. Khairdi, we do not think that contempt petition is the remedy of the petitioner.

2. The order dated 16-7-2012 merely directs expeditious disposal of the representation in accordance with law.

3. We do not know the representation is addressed to whom and for what reason. If the representation is addressed to the Deputy Director of Education, Pune Region, Pune, then possibly he may deal with it, but if it is not and concerns

suresh

20-CP-500.2013.doc

something between the petitioner's school and its Headmaster or directs the petitioner to comply with an order of shifting of the school, then the Division Bench direction is of no avail and assistance. If that is not complied with, no action in civil contempt can be initiated. The petition is entirely misconceived and is dismissed.

(R.I. CHAGLA, J.)

(S.C. DHARMADHIKARI, J.)