



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

69 CONT. PETITION NO. 260 OF 2017
IN WP/10073/2012

Chudaman Arjun Chaudhari
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra And Others

...

- Mr. Deshmukh Anand I., Advocate for the Petitioner
- Mr. K. S. Patil, AGP for Respondent/s – State
- Sr. Adv. Sanjeev Deshpande i/b. Mr. S. S. Dande, Advocate for Respondent No. 4

...

CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI AND
VAISHALI PATIL – JADHAV, JJ.

DATE : 13th OCTOBER, 2025

PER COURT :

1. Respondents have complied with the directions issued by this Court. We, therefore, find that they have purged the contempt.
2. Learned advocate for the petitioner claims that interest needs to be given to the petitioner. By making such submission he is trying to expand the scope of the contempt proceedings. We are not inclined to enlarge scope of the contempt proceedings.
3. Contempt Petition is, therefore, **disposed of** with liberty to the petitioner to file appropriate proceeding.

[VAISHALI PATIL – JADHAV, J.]

[NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.]