



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 451 OF 2019
IN WP/1473/2018**

DEEPAK DILIPRAO NAGARGOJE
VERSUS

SHRI. MADHAV KALE, THE SELECTION COMMITTEE, MANAGING
DIRECTOR, MAHARASHTRA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION,
MUMBAI AND ANOTHER

...
Mr. Shirinivas S. Wagh, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr. D.S. Bagul, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 And 2
...

**CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI &
MANJUSHA DESHPANDE, J.J.**

DATE : 01st APRIL, 2025

PER COURT :

1. Petitioner alleges contempt of the order passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.1473/2018 on 31/01/2019, whereby it is directed that "the case of the petitioner shall be considered for the post meant for PAP category wherever available according to the marks obtained by the petitioner".
2. Perusal of the above order shows that petitioner had applied from NT-D category and there was no post meant for PAP in NT-D category. Therefore, petitioner was considered for the post reserved for NT-D Category only. Advertisement shows that there is no post meant for NT-D (PAP) category. This Court, therefore, observed that petitioner cannot be considered for the post of open (PAP) category and that the petitioner has also paid fees meant for

reserved category.

3. Record shows that pursuant to the order passed by this Court, petitioner was appointed on the post of Traffic Inspector (Junior) on 25/07/2022. Petitioner now claims that person namely Sagar Patil who has secured 138 marks is appointed on the post of Assistant Traffic Superintendent (ATS) and since petitioner had given choice of that post, petitioner should have been appointed on that post.

4. In view of the observations made by this Court in the order dated 31/01/2019 and as the said order is complied with by the respondents by appointing petitioner on the post of Traffic Inspector (Junior), we do not find any merit in the contempt petition. There is no substance in the argument of petitioner that, since he is not appointed on the post of Assistant Traffic Superintendent, respondents have committed contempt of the order passed by this Court. The contempt petition being devoid of merit is dismissed.

(MANJUSHA DESHPANDE, J.)

(NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.)