



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

926 CONT. PETITION NO. 445 OF 2024
IN WP/14114/2023

VIKAS RAMDAS PATIL
VERSUS
VIJAY WAGHMARE AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Sabnis Ameya N.
AGP for Respondent No. 4 : Mr. G.A. Kulkarni

...

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
ROHIT W. JOSHI, JJ.

DATE : 13th DECEMBER, 2024

ORDER :

1. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner and learned AGP for respondent no. 4.
2. It appears to be a belated compliance in the present matter. Now the petitioner wants to raise that the said compliance, in whatever manner it is done, is not as per the order passed by this Court. According to him, the pay scale which is fixed in respect of him is not as per the government resolution. According to him, that pay scale was considered by this Court while passing the order.
3. We have perused the order dated 07.11.2023 in Writ Petition No. 14114/2023. Respondent no. 4 was directed to make a scrutiny of the record of the petitioner, at which he was deployed for performing his duties within 30 days and, thereafter, if there is no legal impediment after such verification, then respondent no. 4 to grant one step pay scale made available to the employees working in the tribal and PESA area along with the arrears and the current salaries was directed to be paid. Now, it appears that there is

dispute as regards which pay scale would be applicable. The concern of the petitioner which he had given by way of endorsement on 26.06.2024 to the Headmaster of the school, was taken note by the Headmaster and he has made communication to respondent no. 4. Respondent no. 4 has filed affidavit in the present matter and according to him, one step pay scale till the petitioner was working has been given to the petitioner and respondent no. 5 to the writ petition has approved the said proposal. Now in contempt petition, we cannot go into the said dispute and, therefore, the learned Advocate for the petitioner seeks permission to approach the appropriate forum to seek the grievance of the petitioner redressed.

4. Taking into consideration the above facts, it is now not necessary to take any action under the Contempt of Courts Act against the respondent no. 4 against whom the simple notice was issued.

5. The petition stands disposed of. If there is right available to the petitioner, the petitioner may exhaust the same.

(ROHIT W. JOSHI, J.)

(SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.)