

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.248 OF 2021
IN CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.381 OF 2014

{Digambar Haribhau Pajgade and another vs. State of Maharashtra and three others (Respondent Nos.1, 2 and 4 deleted)}

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

Shri Shashibhushan Wahane, Advocate for
petitioners.

Shri Firdos Mirza, Advocate for respondent no.3

CORAM : SUNIL B. SHUKRE AND
G.A. SANAP, JJ.

DATED : OCTOBER 06, 2022

Heard Shri Wahane, learned Counsel for
the petitioners, and Shri Mirza, learned Counsel for
the respondent no.3.

2) It appears that there is a dispute as to the
facts of the case in between petitioners on one hand
and the respondent no.3 on the other. While it is
the contention of Shri Mirza, learned Counsel for the
respondent no.3, that Yavatmal Police is providing
security to the petitioners on the dates of hearing of
whistle blowers' matters before the Courts, it is the
contention of the Shri Wahane, learned Counsel for
the petitioners, that this is not so.

- 3) In fact, in a case like this, it would be appropriate that the petitioners and the respondent no.3 sit together and sort out the matter in between themselves. Ultimately, there is a decision already taken by the concerned Committee to provide selective security to the petitioners and, therefore, it is for the respondent no.3 to implement the decision of the concerned Committee in its letter and spirit. For this purpose, the respondent no.3 may call for necessary details from the petitioners as well as his own Department, verify the facts of the case and then take a proper decision in the matter.
- 4) With the above observations, we dispose of the contempt petition.

JUDGE

JUDGE

khj