

Urmila Ingale

URMILA
PRAMOD
INGALE
Digitally signed
by URMILA
PRAMOD
INGALE
Date:
2021.09.29
10:59:14 +0530

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

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 140 OF 2019
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 8547 OF 2017**

Mahadev Shriram Chaure ..Petitioner
vs.
State of Maharashtra and ors. ..Respondents

Mr.Jagdish G. Aradwad (Reddy), for Petitioner.
Mr.Vikas M. Mali, AGP for State - Respondent No.1.
Mr.Vijay Killedar, for Respondents No. 2 & 3.

**CORAM : R.D.DHANUKA, J.
M. S. KARNIK, J.**

DATE: SEPTEMBER 28, 2021

P.C. :

. Mr.Killedar, learned Counsel for respondents no. 2 and 3,
on instructions, states that the judgment dated 24/10/2018 passed
by this Court in Writ Petition No. 8547 of 2017 would be complied
with within 10 weeks from today without fail. Statement made by
learned Counsel is accepted as an undertaking to this Court.

2. We make it clear that by the said judgment, this Court
had directed that the petitioner be treated as regular employee and

further directed that the petitioner should be declared as surplus along with the other employees by following similar criteria that is applied to the employees working with respondents no. 4 and 5 and to be absorbed in accordance with their seniority. This Court while allowing the said Writ Petition declared that the Government Resolution dated 19/09/2016 was not applicable in the present case and has accordingly declared the impugned order having been passed on an erroneous premises that Government Resolution dated 19/09/2016 is applicable and was accordingly unsustainable. The respondents thus will have to comply with the said order with effect from the academic year 2015-16 and not from the date of the said judgment as sought to be canvassed by learned Counsel for respondents no. 2 and 3.

3. In view of the statement made by respondents no. 2 and 3, we do not initiate any action under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

4. The Contempt Petition is accordingly disposed of. Place the matter on board for reporting compliance after 10 weeks. It is made clear that if the said order as well as the order passed by this

Court today is not complied with by respondents no. 2 and 3, appropriate action under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 would be initiated against the concerned officers of respondents no. 2 and 3.

5. Parties to act upon authenticated copy of this order.

(M.S. KARNIK, J.)

(R.D.DHANUKA, J.)