

Amberkar

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 713 OF 2025

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 11733 OF 2025

Mangal Rajendra Kamthe

.. Petitioner

Versus

The Tahsildar,
Purandhar & Ors.

.. Respondents

.....

- Mr. Laxman Deshmukh a/w Mr. Ninad Pawar i/by Mr. Shivaji Masal, Advocates for Petitioner
- Ms. V.R. Raje, AGP for State

.....

CORAM : MILIND N. JADHAV, J.

DATE : NOVEMBER 17, 2025

P. C.:

1. Heard Mr. Deshmukh, learned Advocate for Petitioner and Ms. Raje, learned AGP for State.

2. Contempt sought in the present Petition is with respect to the directions contained in paragraph No. 7 of the order dated 08.09.2025 passed by this Court.

3. Mr. Deshmukh would point out that the subject matter was heard by this Court (Coram : Madhav J. Jamdar, J.) on 08.09.2025 and directions contained in paragraph No. 6 directing the Petitioners to file fresh Revision proceedings under the provisions of Mamlatdar's Court Act was given and it was also directed that the order which is impugned in the Writ Petition would not be implemented until

30.09.2025. Grievance of Contempt Petitioner is that despite this order having been passed on 08.09.2025, Tahsildar implemented the previous order and carried out construction on the contentious property.

4. *Prima facie* it is seen that the order dated 08.09.2025 was uploaded on the High Court website on 20:59:34 Hrs i.e. at 8.59 p.m. on 08.09.2025. Mr. Deshmukh would however contend that after the said order was dictated and pronounced at about 3.30 p.m., he immediately thereafter informed the Advocate of Petitioners before the Trial Court that said order was passed and to convey the same to the Tahsildar.

5. From the above, it is *prima facie* seen that the order of Court even if it was orally informed may have been conveyed only after 3.30 p.m. Be that as it may Mr. Deshmukh informs the Court that the work was proceeded on that date and the same has thereafter been halted in view of the order dated 08.09.2025 which directs the Tahsildar not to take any coercive steps. Grievance of Petitioner is that 50% of the work has been done on the property.

6. I cannot hold the Respondent in contempt of any of the directions contained in the order as they did not have specific notice of the directions contained in paragraph No. 7 thereof on 08.09.2025

when they executed 50% of the work. However since the Petitioners have complied with the directions contained in paragraph No. 6, it shall be open to Petitioners to pursue the same before the Tahsildar in accordance with law. I do not find any reason in the present Petition such as to hold any action for contempt on the part of Respondents in the above facts. No case for contempt is made out. Contempt Petition is therefore dismissed and disposed.

Amberkar

[MILIND N. JADHAV, J.]

RAVINDRA
MOHAN
AMBERKAR

Digitally signed
by RAVINDRA
MOHAN
AMBERKAR
Date:
2025.11.17
19:18:39 +0530