

Shabnoor

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.642 OF 2024

Vijay Sakharam Gaikar ... Petitioner
V/s.
Haresh K Nanwani & Ors. ... Respondents

**WITH
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.643 OF 2024**

Akhilesh A Chaubey ... Petitioner
V/s.
Haresh K Nanwani & Ors. ... Respondents

**WITH
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.644 OF 2024**

Atmaram V. Kotare ... Petitioner
V/s.
Haresh K Nanwani & Ors. ... Respondents

**WITH
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.645 OF 2024**

Uttam M Chandvale ... Petitioner
V/s.
Haresh K Nanwani & Ors. ... Respondents

**WITH
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.646 OF 2024**

Vimal Manohar Bhartu ... Petitioner
V/s.
Haresh K Nanwani & Ors. ... Respondents

**WITH
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.647 OF 2024**

Jadavati Gulabshankar Pande	... Petitioner
V/s.	
Haresh K Nanwani & Ors.	... Respondents

**WITH
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.648 OF 2024**

Bhashkar D Mistry	... Petitioner
V/s.	
Haresh K Nanwani & Ors.	... Respondents

**WITH
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.649 OF 2024**

Ganpat B. Asurkar	... Petitioner
V/s.	
Haresh K Nanwani & Ors.	... Respondents

Mr. Yuvraj D. Patil, for the petitioner in all Cps.
Mr. Kishor Patil i/b Rajeev Sharma, for respondent
Nos.1 to 3 in all CPs.

CORAM : AMIT BORKAR, J.

DATED : OCTOBER 15, 2025

P.C.:

1. The contemnor has filed an undertaking dated 15 October 2025. The same is taken on record and accepted.
2. In paragraphs 12 and 13 of the said undertaking, the contemnor has undertaken to pay an amount of ₹15,000 to the petitioners with effect from 1 October 2025. The said payment shall be made before Diwali, i.e., on or before 20 October 2025. To

explain the earlier delay or non-compliance, the contemnor has referred to the order dated 2 July 2025 passed by the Executive Engineer, Slum Rehabilitation Authority (SRA).

3. On examining the said order, it is noticed that the Executive Engineer acted upon a complaint made by a local MLA alleging violations of rules and regulations. The allegations are general in nature and not supported by any verified facts or judicial directions. The order does not disclose any concrete material establishing that the alleged violations were genuine. In such a situation, it is difficult to understand how the Executive Engineer could have halted the work merely on the basis of unverified allegations. Every administrative order, particularly by a statutory authority like the SRA, must rest on legal foundation and reliable evidence. When a party is already facing contempt proceedings before this Court under Article 215 of the Constitution of India, such interference by another public authority without legal backing has the potential to obstruct the course of justice.

4. The Court therefore expects that the Executive Engineer shall reconsider the order dated 2 July 2025 in accordance with law. This Court hopes that prudence and fairness guide such reconsideration.

5. It is necessary to observe that statutory authorities must act with responsibility. Entertaining unverified or politically motivated complaints erodes public faith in administration. When political considerations begin to influence administrative decisions, it not only undermines the rule of law but also hampers the effective

execution of judicial directions. The Executive Engineer shall, therefore, re-examine the matter objectively and take a reasoned decision by the next date of hearing.

6. The contemnor shall, on or before the next date, pay a one-time sum of ₹60,000 to the petitioners. This amount shall be paid exclusively to the petitioners in recognition of the time, effort, and expenses incurred by them in pursuing these proceedings.

7. It is clarified that no other slum dwellers shall have any claim over this amount, as the present petitioners alone have borne the burden of litigation and related expenses.

8. Having regard to the undertaking dated 15 October 2025 and the assurances contained therein, no further directions are necessary at this stage. All contempt petitions are accordingly disposed of.

9. However, the matter shall be listed on 17 November 2025 for the limited purpose of verifying compliance with the undertaking and ensuring that the directions of this Court have been duly carried out.

(AMIT BORKAR, J.)