

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

214 CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 446 OF 2022
IN WP/464/2020

VINAYAK S/O BABURAO JADHAV
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

AND
215 CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 449 OF 2022
IN WP/9463/2019

RAMHARI S/O SAMBHAJI PACHPULE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

.....

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Kishor R. Doke
AGP for Respondent No.1 : Mr. S. G. Karlekar
Advocate for Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 : Mr. S. D. Kaldate

.....

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

DATED : 26 SEPTEMBER 2022

PER COURT :-

1. Pursuant to the order of this Court dated 19.08.2022, respondent nos. 2 and 3 are present in the Court. An affidavit has been filed dated 25.09.2022 by the C.E.O. in both these matters.

2. It appears from the record that, on account of the inaction by the Zilla Parishad in the past with regard to the implementation of the order of this Court dated 09.01.2020, that the present C.E.O. has to remain present in the Court since the Contempt Petitions have been

filed. We are informed that three petitioners out the total five, who were before the Court in Writ Petitions, have benefited from the order passed by this Court. Only two petitioners, i.e. the petitioners in these two Contempt Petitions before us, did not get the benefits of the order since, after their retirement, their service book was required and the same was not purportedly tendered. Vinayak tendered his duplicate service book on 15.09.2022 and Ramhari submitted his service book on 20.09.2022, with the Zilla Parishad.

3. The learned Advocate representing the respondent Zilla Parishad submits, on instructions, that the record of both these petitioners would be scrutinized and after due verification and upon assessing their eligibility, they would be paid the dues as per the order passed by this Court, on or before 30.12.2022.

4. The learned Advocate for the petitioners submits that their payments be made by 30.12.2022, since their eligibility has already been considered and accepted and both of them are now eligible for the payments as per the order of this Court. Since both the petitioners are satisfied, it is submitted that the contempt may be treated as being purged.

5. In view of the above, both these petitions are disposed off by treating the contempt as being purged.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.]

[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.]

vre