

Santosh

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 14/2023
IN
CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 9 OF 2023

SUNIL CHAUHAN ... Petitioner.

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THR. THE
SECRETARY (LABOUR),
GOVT. OF GOA AND 4 OR Respondents.

The Petitioner in person.

Mr Deep Shirodkar, Addl. Govt. Advocate *for the Respondent - State.*

**CORAM: M. S. SONAK &
BHARAT P. DESHPANDE, JJ.**

DATED: 31st July 2023

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr Sunil Chavan, who appears in person. This is a second contempt petition filed by Mr Sunil Chavan. Even this contempt petition is equally misconceived.

2. In paragraph 8 of the contempt petition, the Petitioner has pleaded as follows :

“8. I petitioner beg and state that as per the order dated 07.03.2022 petitioner followed the order in the labour court and on other side Hon'ble Presiding Officer Shree Suresh N Narulkar, Labour Court -II, Panaji - Goa, Respondent No. 2 did not issued/furnished/supplied the authenticated copy of award and petitioner received the

award dated 10.08.2021 by registered A.D in which award was not signed by the presiding officer and there was only having stamp/seal of the labour court and it was not a authenticated copy of award.”

3. When we asked Mr Chavan to produce for our perusal a copy of the award received by him, he maintained that he received no copy. This statement is obviously incorrect given his own pleadings in paragraph 8 quoted above.

4. Mr Chavan states that what is received by him, according to him, is not a certified copy. Again, merely because the copy received by the Petitioner does not bear the signature of the Presiding Officer, and bears only seal and stamp, does not mean that the same is not a certified copy.

5. In the earlier contempt petition, instituted by the Petitioner, the Petitioner had made some grievance. Despite explaining to the Petitioner that he can take out proceedings in accordance with law based on the copy received by him, the Petitioner insists that the Respondents committed a contempt.

6. We find that in the earlier contempt petition, the Petitioner had placed on record (at page 43) a certified true copy of the award. Yet, the Petitioner is neither taking out any proceedings against such an award, if he so wishes, nor has he filed any petition to challenge the said award. The entire time is being wasted in filing contempt petitions, which are wholly misconceived. We were in fact considering imposing costs of ₹10,000/-. Because he says that he is still unemployed, we

refrain from imposing such costs on this occasion. Further, we reiterate our observations in the order dated 12th June 2023 by which we dismissed the Petitioner's previous Contempt Petition No.9/2023.

7. There is no contempt whatsoever. This contempt petition is dismissed. However, this time we refrain from imposing any costs on the Petitioner.

BHARAT P. DESHPANDE, J.

M. S. SONAK, J.

SANTOSH S MHAMAL
SANTOSH S MHAMAL
Digitally signed by
SANTOSH S MHAMAL
Date: 2023.07.31
16:02:56 +05'30'