



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO. 1674 OF 2025

(Shri Santosh Gopichand Dhok Vs. Deputy Commissioner (Revenue), Nagpur & Ors.)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. K.R. Lule, A.G.P. for the respondents/State.

.....

CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE, J.
APRIL 3, 2025

Heard petitioner in-person.

2] On previous date, after having heard Ms Kirti Satpute, learned Counsel (appointed) for the petitioner, the delay in filing application for restoration of petition, was condoned and the application seeking restoration of petition was also allowed. The Registry was directed to register the petition.

3] Today, the petitioner in-person is present. Ms Satpute, learned Counsel, is also present. She submits that on previous date, the petitioner met her and said that he does not know her, and further threatened her of filing complaint, if she appeared on his behalf.

4] As such, the petitioner has denied that he threatened Ms Satpute of lodging complaint, however, the manner in which the petitioner behaved in the Court today, which includes raising his voice and saying that he may be lodged in jail but will not pay cost, if imposed by the Court, goes to show that there is every likelihood that the petitioner has threatened Ms Satpute. Even otherwise,

there is no reason why should the appointed Counsel make such a grievance against persons, like the petitioner.

5] I intended to impose heavy cost upon the petitioner, considering his conduct in the Court, however, in order to give one opportunity and having explained him the consequences of such behaviour, for the time being, the order of imposing cost is kept in abeyance and will be considered if there is no improvement shown by the petitioner.

6] The petitioner seeks time to engage an Advocate of his choice. Granted.

7] Ms Kirti Satpute, learned Counsel, stands discharged.

8] The order passed by this Court is now explained to the petitioner in Marathi, to which he says that he will not engage Advocate and will not even appear in Court, whatever the consequences may be.

9] Thus, it appears that there is no scope of improvement and, therefore, the petition is dismissed. In the result, Civil Application No. 827/2025 also stands disposed of.

(ANIL L. PANSARE, J.)

Sumit