

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

BENCH AT AURANGABAD

972 CONT. PETITION NO.351 OF 2021

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 7204 OF 2021

SHIVCHARAN MITTHUSINGH JADHAV

VERSUS

**ZILLA PARISHAD, NANDED THR ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
AND OTHERS**

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. P. G. Godhamgaonkar
AGP for Respondent No.2 & 3: Mr. S. B. Pulkundwar

...

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
R. N. LADDHA, JJ.**

DATE : 21st October, 2021

P.C. :

. This Court, under order dated 02.07.2021, had directed the respondent No.2 therein to decide the representation of the petitioner, preferably within a period of four (04) weeks.

2. Mr. Pulkundwar, the learned counsel submits that, the same has been decided under order dated 30.08.2021. The learned counsel also submits that, the CEO tenders unconditional apology for the delay of three weeks in deciding the representation.

3. This Court had directed the CEO to decide the proceedings within a period of four weeks. The order was passed on 02.07.2021. It could have been decided by 01.08.2021. However, the

representation is decided on 30.08.2021. We do not see an abnormal delay in the representation being decided.

4. Mr. Godhamgaonkar, the learned counsel submits that, the order rejecting the application of the petitioner is not in consonance with the guidelines and the policy.

5. The same would be subject matter of consideration on merits. The petitioner may assail the order as may be permissible under law. However, in contempt petition, the merits of the order cannot be gone into.

6. As the contempt stands purged, the Contempt Petition is disposed of. No costs.

(R. N. LADDHA, J.)

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.)