

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 18 OF 2020 IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 3317 OF 2018 (D)

(Ambika Prasad Bajrangicharan Oza (Dead) thr. LR's Mamta Ambikaprasad Oza & Ors. Vs.
Smt. Vandana Krushna & Ors.)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Shri A.C. Dharmadhikari, Advocate for the LR's of the
petitioner.

Mrs. S.S. Jachak, A.G.P for the respondents.

.....

CORAM : A.S. CHANDURKAR &
PUSHPA V. GANEDIWALA, JJ.
FEBRUARY 10, 2021.

Heard.

2. This Court vide order dated 19/09/2018
passed in Writ Petition No. 3317/2018 in para 7 has
issued directions to respondent No. 3 as under :

*"7. Respondent no. 3 is directed to send a
proposal regarding payment of outstanding
salary due to the original petitioner and to
be paid to his legal heirs now, to respondent
no. 2 within two weeks from the date of
receipt of this order and, on receipt of the
same, respondent no. 2 is directed to
forward the said proposal with his
favourable recommendation to the Director
(Primary Education), Pune, within one
week from the receipt of the proposal for its
sanction by the latter and, on receipt of the
same Direction (Primary Education), Pune*

shall accord his sanction within one week thereafter.”

3. Respondent No. 3 filed the reply affidavit on record stating therein that the directions, as given in the aforesaid order, have been duly complied with, and an amount of Rs.5,79,538/-(rupees five lakh seventy nine thousand five hundred and thirty eight) has been paid to each of the legal representatives of the petitioner.

4. Shri Dharmadhikari, learned Counsel for the petitioners, seeks time to take instructions as to whether the LR's of the petitioner have claimed for any interest for delayed payment.

5. A perusal of the aforesaid order would reflect that no such directions were issued with regard to interest on delayed payment. It is open for the LR's of the petitioner to seek appropriate remedy in this regard, if so advised.

6. In the given facts, so also considering the fact that the directions issued by this Court vide the aforesaid order, have been duly complied with by respondent No. 3, this Court is of the opinion that no purpose would be served in keeping the petition pending. It is disposed of accordingly.

(JUDGE)

Sumit

(JUDGE)