

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONT. PETITION NO.519 OF 2019  
IN WP/7362/2018

TATYARAO DHONDIRAM CHAVAN AND OTHERS  
VERSUS  
RAJGOPAL DEVARA AND OTHERS

Mr.S.K.Mathpati, Advocate for the petitioners.  
Mr.S.G.Sangle, AGP for respondent No.2.  
Mrs.M.A.Deshpande, Advocate for respondent Nos. 3 and 4.

( CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND  
ARUN R. PEDNEKER, JJ.)

DATE : SEPTEMBER 20, 2022

PER COURT :

1. On 30.07.2018, this Court had passed an order in WP No.7362/2018 filed by **Tatyrao Dhondiram Chavan and others Versus State of Maharashtra and others.** In paragraph Nos. 4, 5 and 6, this Court had issued directions, which read thus :-

*“4. In the circumstances, we dispose of this petition with liberty to the petitioners to submit a further detailed representation with supporting documents before the Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Aurangabad. On receipt of such a representation, the said Authority shall consider the same and shall forward its report / proposal to the competent authority i.e. respondent Nos. 2 and 3.*

*5. On receipt of said report / proposal, the respondent Nos. 2 and 3*

*shall examine the same and shall take appropriate decision taking into consideration the aforesaid policy dated 12.12.2000 and in accordance with law, as also the observations made by Division Bench of this Court in the case of Suresh Raghoba Bhowate Vs. State of Maharashtra and others in Writ Petition No.6116/2014 alongwith connected petitions decided at Nagpur Bench on 16.12.2014 as also the order dated 29.06.2016 passed in the case of Dhanraj Shivaji Vani Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others in Writ Petition No.6382/2016 along with connected petitions decided at Bombay.*

*6. Let the entire exercise, as aforesaid, be completed by the Chief Executive Officer as also respondent Nos. 2 and 3 within four months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.”*

2. The learned Advocate representing respondent Nos. 3 and 4 submits that the then C.E.O., Zilla Parishad had passed orders.

3. The grievance of the petitioners is that merely passing orders without implementing them and without making the payment to the petitioners, is a futile exercise and would only create a farce that the orders have been complied with.

4. We find that the submission of the petitioners is well placed in view of the fact that this Court had expected the entire exercise to be concluded by 30.11.2018. Until this date, the payments have not been

made.

5. The learned Advocate representing the Zilla Parishad submits that the payments would be made to the petitioners by scrutinizing their respective shares, on or before 21.10.2022.

6. The learned Advocate representing the Zilla Parishad places on record a decision dated 19.09.2022 taken by the present C.E.O., Zilla Parishad, Aurangabad. The same (2 pages) is taken on record and marked as "X" for identification.

7. The learned Advocate for the petitioners submits that the said statement may be recorded and the petitioners would be satisfied.

8. In view of the above, this petition is disposed off in the light of the statement made on instructions that the petitioners would be paid their dues on or before 21.10.2022. Needless to state, if this statement is not effected on account of the State Government having not supplied funds, we would hold the 4 respondents in this petition, guilty of aggravated contempt, if proved.

( ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J. )

( RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)