

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

SUO-MOTO CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 5 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 4379 OF 2025
WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 4380 OF 2025

High Court on it's own motion ... Petitioner
versus
Rajendra Manik Ahire ... Respondent

Mr.Sujeet G. Karlekar with Mr.Akshay S. Karlekar for the
Respondent -Contemnor.

Mr. Rajendra Manik Ahire, Respondent- Contemnor is present in
person.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.

DATE : 2nd May, 2025

P.C. :-

1. We had passed a speaking order on 8th April, 2025 in
Writ Petition No. 4379 of 2025 and a group of cases (*Shobha
Sarjerao Markad & Ors. versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors.*).

2. The factual matrix is evident from the contents of our
order. We, therefore, concluded that the Respondent Contemnor,
who had withdrawn an identical order before this Court in Writ

Petition No. 9695 of 2024, could not have once again reverted back to the same order with regard to Shobha Sarjerao Markad and others. Within a short span of around three months, he could not have passed the same order which he was compelled to withdraw before this Court in Writ Petition No. 9695 of 2024.

3. The learned Advocate representing the Respondent Contemnor submits that the Contemnor, who is present in the Court, has filed an affidavit dated 23rd April, 2025. He has tendered an unconditional apology and submits that he lost sight of the fact that the Petitioners (Shobha Sarjerao Markad and others) before this Court were identically placed with the two Petitioners in Writ Petition No. 9695 of 2024. He has plainly stated that because of oversight, he passed the order, which has been set aside by this Court vide the order dated 8th April, 2025 in ***Shobha Sarjerao Markad and others (supra)***. It is stated in the affidavit that this is the first time that such a mistake has occurred. The same is inadvertent. Now the record would be set right and the Petitioners would not be required to make any further grievance. He has regret and remorse for the lapse that has occurred. He, therefore, prays for a pardon.

4. In view of the above and since it appears that an unconditional apology has been tendered with a bonafide intention, that we are conclude that the Contemnor has purged the instant contempt proceedings.

5. **The Contempt Petition is disposed off.**

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)