



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

971 CONT. PETITION NO. 350 OF 2016
IN CRA/134/2016

SHANTABAI PANDHARINATH KALE THROUGH GPA PRAKASH
PANDHARINATH KALE
VERSUS
RAMDAS PANDURANG BHOLE, LRS SUDHAKAR RAMDAS BHOLE AND
ANOTHER

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

Dated : December 18, 2025

PER COURT :-

1. None present for the petitioner.
2. Perused the contempt petition. The present contempt petition is initiated for violation of order dated 21.4.2015. Perusal of the order dated 21.4.2015 would reveal that the advocate for contemner has made statement that till the next date the possession of suit property would not be taken in contravention of the decree. However, there is no stay to the execution proceedings and the possession of the land not is taken by the land owner during the pendency of the writ proceeding before this Court. The order of executing court only states that notice is issued to the tenant to appear in the execution proceeding. There is no stay granted to the execution proceeding. I do not see any contempt being committed by the landlord and there is no reason to initiate contempt petition. The contempt petition is dismissed accordingly.

(ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.)

ssc/