



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONT. PETITION NO. 321 OF 2024
IN WP/9587/2023

Manohar Chimaji Chalak

....Petitioner

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through
The Principal Secretary & Others

.....Respondents

.....
Mr. V.P. Narwade, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr. S.D. Ghayal, Addl. G.P for State
Mr. P.A. Pisal, Advocate for respondent No. 3
.....

**CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI AND
MANJUSHA DESHPANDE, JJ.**

DATE : 03rd APRIL, 2025

ORDER :

1. Petitioner seems to be RTI activist is claiming that respondents have committed contempt of order passed by this court on 07.08.2023, wherein this Court has observed as follows:

"1. The grievance of the Petitioner is that the order of the State Information Commission under the RTI Act has not been executed. It is conceded that the Petitioner has not moved any application under Section 20 of the said Act.

2. The learned advocate representing the Zilla Parishad submits that a letter dated 03.08.2023 has been issued to the Petitioner. He is called upon to remain present in the office on 11.08.2023 and tick mark the documents.

The said identified documents would be supplied to him. He regrets that the time is not mentioned in the said letter. The Petitioner can remain present at 11.30 a.m. on 11.08.2023.

*3. In view of the above, **this petition is disposed off.**"*

2. Respondents have filed affidavit in reply of third respondent, Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Beed, stating that information was sent to the petitioner by letter dated 10.01.2025 through Speed Post, which is delivered to the petitioner on 15.01.2025. The copy of letter and postal extract of delivery report is placed on record.

3. Petitioner now complains that respondents are not removing encroachment on the Government land. Respondents contend that Civil Suit is pending in respect of said encroachment, in which Civil Court has appointed T.I.L.R. as Court Commissioner for measurement of said land. Since the matter is subjudice before the competent Civil Court, respondents are not in a position to take any action.

4. Petitioner is trying to enlarge the scope of contempt petition, which cannot be permitted. In view of compliance of the order, contempt petition is disposed of.

(MANJUSHA DESHPANDE, J.)

(NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.)