

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

**90 CONT. PETITION NO.419 OF 2022
IN WP/9271/2016**

**PRIYANKA VIJAY BARHATE
VERSUS
DR SANTOSH WAGHUJI CHAVAN AND ANOTHER**

...
Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Patil Sandesh R.
AGP for Respondent/State : Mr. S.G. Sangle
...

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

DATED : AUGUST 23, 2022.

PER COURT :

1. In the light of the directions set out in paragraph nos. 6 and 7 of the order, dated 28th April, 2017, delivered in Writ Petition no. 9271/2016, the concerned authority has taken a decision on 27.1.2021. The same has been communicated to the Divisional Joint Director, Higher Education vide communications dated 5.2.2021 and 10.2.2021.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that though the decision has been taken, which is partly correct, the petitioner is not satisfied. According to him, the authorities have committed an error in arriving at a decision.
3. In our view, to hold the respondents in contempt, it must be established that there is a deliberate, willful and intentional disobedience of the order of the Court. We find these elements

missing.

4. The learned advocate for the petitioner submits, on instructions, that the petitioner desires to challenge the decision arrived at by the authorities and would file a writ petition.

5. In view of the above, this petition is disposed off. Needless to state, that the petitioner would be at liberty to assail the order, to seek redressal of her grievance.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER J.]

[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.]

SSC/