



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

CONT. PETITION NO. 579 OF 2025

Ramkrushna Dnyandev Mahajan

VERSUS

Ramesh Hemlal Mahajan

...

Mr. Bhushan Mahajan, Advocate for the Petitioner

Mr. S. S. Dande, AGP for Respondents-State

Mr. V. P. Patil, Advocate for Respondent no.1

.....

CORAM : AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, J.

DATED : 16TH OCTOBER, 2025

ORDER :-

. Vide the last order passed by this Court dated 01.10.2025, it was observed that Mr. S. S. Dande, learned AGP had made statement that he would apprise and explain the respondent no.2 about the disobedience caused at the hands of the respondent no.2 in the implementation of the orders passed by this Court. A statement was further made before this Court that within two weeks from thereafter, the '*Vahivat Rasta*' shall be restored to the petitioner.

2. Today, Mr. S. S. Dande, learned AGP would submit that the said '*Vahivat Rasta*' has been restored by the Mandal Adhikari/Circle Officer Dharangaon Division Tq. Dharangaon,

Jalgaon by conducting a due panchnama on 10.10.2025. Mr. Dande, learned AGP would submit that the respondent no.2 had even given notice on 07.10.2025 to both the parties that the possession of '*Vahivat Rasta*' would be restored on 10.10.2025 at 11:00 a.m., and the parties to remain. Mr. S. S. Dande, learned AGP would submit that the intimation was served to both the parties and they have acknowledged receipt of that intimation. Mr. S. S. Dande, learned AGP would therefore submit that now there is absolute compliance of the order passed by this Court and contempt proceedings be dropped against the respondent.

3. Mr. Bhushan Mahajan, learned Advocate accepts that the subject matter/*Vahivat Rasta* has been restored to the petitioner and his grievance is solved now. Mr. V. P. Patil, learned Advocate for respondent no.1 also submits that although his client has not appeared at the time of panchnama but he had not obstructed the restoration of the *Vahivat Rasta*.

4. Mr. S. S. Dande, learned AGP would submit that even today, the respondent no.2/Mandal Adhikari is personally present in this Court to show her bonafides and he is instructed to express apology for the delay caused in

implementation of the order. He would further submit that the respondent no.2 had no otherwise intention in disobeying or delaying the implementation of the order but except due to misimpression about the official procedure to be carried out, the delay has been caused.

5. The apology is accepted as order under contempt is complied by respondent no.2, the Contempt Petition stands **disposed** of. The letter dated 07.10.2025, 11.10.2025 and panchnama dated 10.10.2025 are taken on record and marked collectively as Exhibit 'X' for identification.

(AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, J.)