IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONT. PETITION NO. 326 OF 2022
IN WP/3219/2022

Anita Rohidas Ukade
VERSUS
Kevalbai Kendre The Secretary Ambika Bahuuddeshiya Mahila Mandal And Others
...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mrs. P.G. Sontakke h/f Mr. Sontakke Gajanan K.
AGP for Respondent/State : Mr. S.G. Joshi
Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 & 2 : Mr. V.D. Gunale
Advocate for Respondent No.3 : Mr. U.B. Bondar
...

CORAM : ROHIT W. JOSHI, J.

DATED : OCTOBER 09, 2026

P.C.:

1. Present contempt petition is filed drawing attention to non-compliance of judgment and order dated 10.03.2022 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.3219 of 2022.

2. It is contended that in compliance of Clause 9(c) of the judgment and order, the petitioner has not been paid subsistence allowance as directed by this Court. Since then, subsistence allowance to the tune of Rs.05,53,818/- was credited to the account of petitioner on 25.04.2022 and further amount of Rs.14,54,943/- was credited to her account on 21.03.2024. The petitioner had disputed the quantum of suspension allowance. In order to avoid any controversy in this regard, this Court had directed the Deputy Director of Education, Latur

to compute the amount of suspension allowance. The Deputy Director of Education appointed a four Member Committee to compute the amount. The Committee has furnished the report dated 07.10.2026 stating that suspension allowance received by the petitioner is proper.

3. In view of the aforesaid, it needs to be held that there is compliance of Clause 9(c) of the order passed by this Court by making payment of suspension allowance, although belatedly.

4. Learned advocate for petitioner states that the respondent/management is liable to pay interest in view of Clause 9(d) of the order and there is non-compliance of order to that extent. Perusal of the order will demonstrate that the management was held liable to pay interest only in the event the pay bills forwarded to the Education Officer were found to be defective. There is no statement on record that the pay bills forwarded by the management are defective.

5. In view of the aforesaid, this Court is not in a position to accept the contention of petitioner that the pay bills were defective and, therefore, the management is liable to pay interest.

6. In view of the fact that the order is complied with, this Court does not see any propriety in continuing the contempt proceeding. The Contempt Petition is disposed of accordingly.

7. In the event, the petitioner has any grievance with respect to computation of amount of suspension allowance, it will be open for her

to take appropriate remedies in accordance with law in that regard.

[ROHIT W. JOSHI J.]

Mujaheed//