



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 995 OF 2024
IN WP/2259/2024

MUNJA SO RAMRAOCHAVAN
VERSUS
ASSOCIATE DEAN OF MAHARASHTRA ANIMAL AND FISHERIES
SCIENCE UNIVERSITY

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Mahesh Deshmukh h/f Mr. S. S.
Gangakhedkar
Addl. GP for Respondents-State : Ms. Kalpalata Bharaswadkar
Advocate for Respondent No. 3 : Mr. P. G. Rodge

CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J. AND
MANJUSHA DESHPANDE, J.

Dated : May 8, 2025

PER COURT :-

1. In order dated 28.02.2025, this Court observed that, *'if these Petitioners are in employment, they would be continued and their salaries would be paid as per their service conditions. If they have been removed from the employment, the post of an 'Ambulance Driver' and the 'Tractor Driver' shall not be filled in by the University, without the permission of this Court'.*

2. The petitioners claim that though they have worked till July 2024, they were paid salary only up to January 2024, therefore, respondents have willfully disobeyed the above order. Petitioners, by relying on communication issued by the Associate Dean of the College dated 06.08.2024 and 13.08.2024, showing

that the petitioners are to be paid salary from February 2024 to May 2024, contend that, petitioners were entitled for the salary for the period from February 2024 to July 2024, but the same is not paid to them, which amounts to contempt.

3. Affidavit-in-reply is filed by respondents No. 1 to 3 stating therein that petitioners' services were engaged on contractual basis through outside agency and their services are stopped completely from 20.06.2024 and 29.01.2024 respectively. In this view of the matter, the petitioners are not entitled for salary for the period of February 2024 till July 2024.

4. Substantive writ petition of the petitioners challenging the order of refusal to regularise their services is pending before this Court. Taking into consideration the statements made in the affidavit-in-reply filed by the respondents, we are of the view that no contempt is committed by the respondents. The contempt petition, is therefore, disposed of.

5. It is made clear that we have not expressed anything on the claim of petitioner about regularisation and above observations are limited only to the extent of deciding the present contempt petition.

(MANJUSHA DESHPANDE, J.) (NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.)