

(1)

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

1104 CONTEMPT PETITION NO.66 OF 2020
IN WP/1954/2018

SMT. URMILA DATTATRAYA GAIKWAD AND OTHERS
VERSUS
MR. PRITHVIRAJ B. P., CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
PARBHANI & ANOTHER

AND
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.69 OF 2020
IN WP/7871/2018

GOPAL VASUDEORAO ARVIKAR AND OTHERS
VERSUS
MR. PRITHVIRAJ B. P., CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
PARBHANI & ANOTHER

AND
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.67 OF 2020
IN WP/13596/2018

VASANT VISHWANATH PAMPATWAR & OTHERS
VERSUS
MR. PRITHVIRAJ B. P., CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
PARBHANI & ANOTHER

AND
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.102 OF 2022
IN WP/6377/2019

SURESH HILAL MALI AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
SMT. WANMATHI C., CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, ZILLA
PARISHAD, DHULE & ANOTHER

....

Mr S. K. Mathpati, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr S. G. Karlekar, A.G.P. for respondents/State
Mr S. D. Kaldate, Advocate for Zilla Parishad, Parbhani
Mr N. N. Desale, Advocate for Zilla Parishad, Dhule

(2)

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

DATE : 16th September, 2022

PER COURT:

1. These are three petitions from District Parbhani and one from District Dhule. It is undisputed that, the order which applies to these petitioners is dated 25/01/2019, passed at Aurangabad in Writ Petition No.1954/2018 (Smt. Urmila Dattatrya Gaikwad & others Vs. State of Maharashtra and others) and connected matters. The operative order below paragraph 8 reads as under :-

“The respondent/Zilla Parishad after confirming themselves of the petitioners being District awardee teachers and awarded certificate prior to 04/09/2018 shall individually consider the case of the petitioners for additional increment as is laid down under the Govt. Resolution dated 12/12/2000. The same shall be considered on its own merits expeditiously preferably within a period of six months.”

2. In these four contempt petitions, the learned Advocate for the petitioners submits that the petitioners' individual cases have been scrutinized and their claims have been rejected.

(3)

3. In our view, this indicates compliance of the order passed by us, vide which, we had directed that the cases of all these petitioners be considered on individual basis. If their claims have been rejected and they have a grievance, they will have to challenge the said decisions independently. In these circumstances, filing contempt petitions, is no remedy.

4. As such, these contempt petitions are disposed off, with liberty to avail of a remedy, as is permissible in law.

(ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

sjk