



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

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.194 OF 2025

IN

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.290 OF 2022 (D)

Sagar S/o Ravindra Chintkutlawar, Dighori, Narsala, Nagpur
vs.

Dyaneshwar Bhedodkar, Police Station Officer, Hudkeshwar Police Station, Nagpur and anr.

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri Laxmikant I. Jaiswal, Advocate, with Shri D. V. Mahajan, Advocate for
petitioner.

Shri S. A. Ashirgade, Assistant Government Pleader for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE AND RAJ D. WAKODE, JJ.

DATED : 8th December, 2025

The petitioner has approached this Court with the grievance that provisions of the Maharashtra Protection of Interest of Depositors (in Financial Establishments) Act, 1999 (for short, MPID Act) are not invoked despite order dated 13/08/2024 in Criminal Writ Petition No.290/2022.

2. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor, had on previous date, informed us that offences under the provisions of MPID Act, were added. We however, posed a question as to why offences were not invoked within three months as directed by the Court.

3. Learned Assistant Government Pleader submits that there was difference in opinion between two senior officers whether provisions of MPID Act, 1999 would be applicable in case. The difference was because of lack of documents which were furnished later on from the office of the Registrar. Thereafter it was unanimously decided that provisions of MPID Act, 1999 would be applicable. He submits that though there is delay, the delay is not intentional and there was no willful disobedience of order.

4. The petitioner is satisfied with the subsequent development.
5. Since the purpose of filing petition has been served, we need not go into the aspect of willful disobedience.
6. The petition is accordingly disposed of.

(Raj D. Wakode, J.)

(Anil L. Pansare, J.)