

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

CONTEMPT PETITION (CP) 220/2023
IN
WRIT PETITION 4258/2022 (D)

VITHALRAO YADAVRAO BOMPILWAR
VS
ABDUL NABI SATTAR, HON'BLE MINISTER OF STATE FOR REVENUE, MUMBAI

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

Mr. M.G. Sarda, Advocate for the petitioner

CORAM : ROHIT B. DEO AND
M. W. CHANDWANI, J.J.

DATED : 10/07/2023

Heard.

2. We have gone through the operative order dated 29.08.2022, non-compliance of which is complained. The operative order is read as under:-

“Considering the order proposed to be passed, notice is made returnable forthwith. Service on the respondent nos.2 to 14 is dispensed with. Learned Additional Government Pleader Shri D.P. Thakre waives service of notice for the respondent nos.1 and 15 to 17.

In proceedings filed by the petitioner before the Divisional Commissioner under Section 257 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966 the revision application as preferred was allowed. The order passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer as well as the Additional Collector came to be set aside. Being aggrieved the respondent nos.2 to 14 have filed proceedings under Section 257 of the Code

before the State Government. On 05.08.2020 the interim order was passed staying the effect and operation of the order passed by the Divisional Commissioner. The grievance of the petitioner is that thereafter the proceedings have not been taken up for consideration.

In these facts and as the appeal is pending for more than two years, it is directed that the said proceedings filed under Section 257 of the Code before the State Government shall be decided expeditiously and preferably within a period of eight weeks from receipt of copy of this order. Due notice shall be given to the revisional applicants in both the proceedings as well as the present petitioner before the matter is taken up for consideration.

With these directions, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.”

3. We do not find that by not deciding the revision application of the petitioner within eight weeks, in any way, is contemptuous act on the part of the respondent.
4. We find no merit in the petition. Hence, the contempt petition is **dismissed**.

(M. W. CHANDWANI, J.)

(ROHIT B. DEO J.)