

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

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 76 OF 2025

Amit Dilip More

...Petitioner

Versus

Rajasaheb Murlidhar Londhe & Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. Rajaram Deshmukh, Thr. V.C., Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. P.P. Kakade, Addl. G.P. a/w Mr. K.S. Thorat, 'B' Panel Counsel
for Respondent Nos.1 & 2/State.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE

&

ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.

DATE : 6th MARCH, 2025

Digitally signed
by SUNNY
ANKUSHRAO
THOTE
Date:
2025.03.11
10:02:31 +0530

P.C. :-

1. Having perused the order of this Court dated 12th June, 2024, passed by the Writ Bench in Writ Petition No.7951 of 2022, filed by the present Petitioner, more particularly the directions set out in Paragraph No.5, we notice that the Accused/Contemnor Rajasaheb Murlidhar Londhe, Education Officer (Secondary), Zilla Parishad, Sangli, has not complied with the directions of this Court. There appears to be no explanation.

2. We, therefore, called upon the learned AGP to take instructions from the Accused/Contemnor, as to whether we should proceed to initiate action under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, since we find that our directions have been disobeyed. After a pass-over post lunch, the learned AGP submits that he has received a written communication from the said Accused/Contemnor through WhatsApp, dated 6th March, 2025, suggesting that he is willing to deposit Rs.5,000/- for each month of delay caused in obeying the order of this Court, as costs. A printout of the copy of the said communication is taken on record and marked as ‘X’ for identification. He also tenders a copy of the order dated 24th February, 2025 that was passed by the said Accused/Contemnor in deference to the order of this Court dated 12th June, 2024. The printout of the said order is marked as ‘Y’ for identification.

3. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner has been repeatedly approaching this Court. On every occasion, the Accused/Contemnor raises a different objection on his proposal. Now, he will again have to challenge the order marked as ‘Y’, since the same is adverse to the interest of the Petitioner.

4. We record that since the Petitioner will now have to challenge the said order, all contentions and grounds available to the Petitioner are kept open to be considered.

5. The delay in passing the order marked as 'Y', is 200 days (6 months and 26 days). We are rounding of this delay to six months, which is over and above the timeline granted to the Accused/Contemnor to obey the order of this Court.

6. As such, this **Contempt Petition is disposed off** by treating the contempt as being purged, in view of the apology and his request to pay costs. An amount of Rs.30,000/- shall be deposited by the Accused/Contemnor Mr. Rajasaheb Murlidhar Londhe, from his salary bank account in this Court, within a period of 30 days.

7. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits that he is required to repeatedly spend on litigation and the said amount may be granted to him. As such, we permit the Petitioner to withdraw the said amount without conditions, on identification by the learned Advocate representing him in this matter. The copy of the PAN Card and the Aadhar Card shall be placed on record along with the

Application for withdrawal, which would be filed with the Registry of this Court.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.) (RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)