

varsha

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 167 OF 2024**

Dattatraya Ratnappa Chavan through power
of attorney holder Dashrath Chandar Chavan
and Ors ... Petitioners

vs.

Nanad Kumar Katkar, Additional Collector,
Kolhapur and Ors ... Respondents

Mr. Rajesh Kachare a/w. Rasika Bagkar i/b. Bagkar and Co., for
Petitioners.

Mrs. Sulbha Chipde, AGP for the State.

CORAM : GAURI GODSE, J.

DATED : 27th MARCH, 2024

P.C. :-

1. This contempt petition is filed alleging breach of an order dated 20th December 2019. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that by the said order, the impugned order dated 8th July 2019 was stayed. He further submitted that though by clause 6 of the order dated 20th December 2019, this Court directed that any action taken pursuant to order dated 8th July 2019, would also remain stayed, the authorities have deleted the names of the petitioners from the revenue record. Thus, according to him there is

deliberate breach of the order dated 20th December 2019 passed by this Court.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners relies upon the order dated 31st May 2017, to contend that pursuant to the said order, petitioners' names were entered in the revenue record. He submitted that on 27th February 2017, based on the order dated 31st May 2017, names of petitioners were entered in the revenue record. Since the order dated 31st May 2017, was set aside by order dated 17th May 2018, the names of the petitioners were deleted on 8th July 2019. He thus, submitted that the authorities have committed deliberate breach of order dated 20th December 2019.

3. I have perused the papers. The averment in the contempt petition in paragraph 8, states that as by order dated 20th December 2019 the actions taken pursuant to the impugned order dated 8th July 2019 were stayed, it was incumbent upon the respondent nos. 5 to 11 to restore the names of the petitioners in 7/12 extract of the suit land and delete the names of respondent nos. 3 and 4. However, in the oral argument, learned counsel for the petitioners made a grievance that though this Court granted interim relief, names of the petitioners were deleted on 8th July 2019. From the dates relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioners as

recorded hereinabove, it appears that the names of the petitioners were already deleted before order was passed by this Court on 20th December 2019. Hence, there is no substance in the grievance made by the petitioners that there is breach of order dated 20th December 2019. Thus, there is also no substance in the argument made on behalf of the petitioners that pursuant to order dated 31st March 2017, names of the petitioners were added to the revenue record on 27th February 2017. The said argument is baseless for the obvious reason that the order relied upon by the petitioners is after the date of entering petitioners' names in the revenue record as submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners.

4. Considering the grievance made in paragraph 8 of the Contempt Petition, it appears that the petitioners intended to get their names entered in the 7/12 extract. In view of the aforesaid dates, there is no substance in the Contempt Petition alleging breach of order dated 20th December 2019.

5. The Contempt Petition is devoid of any merits. For the reasons stated above, Contempt Petition is dismissed.

(GAURI GODSE, J.)