



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

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 693 OF 2024  
IN WP/13049/2022

SARIKA D/O GANESH JOSHI  
VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR ITS SECRETARY SHRI  
RANJITSINGH DEOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT MANTRALAYA

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. V. S. Panpatte  
AGP for Respondents/State : Mr. S. J. Salgare  
Advocate for Respondents No.4 and 5 : Mr. Nilesh N. Desale

...

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

**DATE : 29-04-2025**

**PER COURT:-**

1. By order dated 20 December 2022 passed in Writ Petition No.13116 of 2022 (*Leena Dharamraj Kakuste vs. The State of Maharashtra through its Principal Secretary and others*) and connected Writ Petitions, the respondents were directed as follows;

“Until further orders, by way of an ad-interim protection, we direct that the services of these petitioners shall not be terminated, if not yet terminated, only on the basis of the impugned order. Their salaries shall be paid to them in view of they being on duty and on the condition of attending duties and performing their jobs. Increments, if any, shall not be granted to these petitioners without the leave of the Court. This protection is limited to the impugned order, meaning thereby that if any petitioner is liable for any action unconnected with the impugned order, the Management would be at liberty to follow the due procedure for initiating appropriate action.”

2. Petitioner's claim disobedience of the above direction in this contempt petition.

3. Dr. B. B. Chavan, Deputy Director of Education, Nashik Division, Nashik / respondent No.3 in the present contempt petition is present in the Court.

4. The Education Officer has filed affidavit-in-reply contending that the salary is being regularly paid to the petitioner.

5. Learned Advocate for the petitioner makes a grievance that only after filing of present contempt petition, the respondent has started paying regular salary to the petitioner. According to him, since arrears of salary are not paid to the petitioner which should have been paid from the date of approval of his services, therefore, respondents are liable for committing punishment for contempt of this Court. We do not agree with the said submission of the learned Advocate for the petitioner, since the respondents are paying regular salary to the petitioner, there is compliance of the direction issued by the Court. Fact remains that the substantive writ petition is still pending for adjudication before this Court. The issue of salary of the arrears of the petitioner will have to be adjudicated in the writ petition and not in this contempt petition. Since there is compliance of the order of which contempt has been alleged, contempt petition is disposed of.

[MANJUSHA DESHPANDE, J.]

[NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.]