



**BIN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**67 CONT. PETITION NO. 18 OF 2026
IN WP/11770/2025**

Yogesh Ramnath Naik

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra

...

Mr. Sushant C. Yeramwar, Advocate for the Petitioner

Mr. Madhukar A. Aher, AGP for Respondents/State

...

**CORAM : SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE AND
ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, JJ.**

DATED : JANUARY 27, 2026

P.C.:

1. This Court by an order dated 25.09.2025 had directed the Respondent No.2/Tribe Committee to decide tribe claim of the petitioner within a period of two months from the date of said order. As the same is not decided, hence this Contempt Petition.
2. Learned AGP at the outset has tendered unconditional apology on behalf of the contemnor. Learned AGP submits that the vigilance cell enquiry has already been concluded. Learned AGP has handed over the copy of the Vigilance Cell Report to the petitioner across the bar.
3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner will file his reply to the Vigilance Cell Report by 02.02.2026 and no separate notice is required for that.
4. Learned AGP further submits that, if possible, the day on which

the petitioner will submit reply, the matter will be heard on the same day. He further submits that if the matter is heard on the date on which the petitioner would file his reply, within a period of two weeks thereafter, the final order would be passed.

5. We accept this statement as an undertaking to this Court. We make it clear that deviation from the undertaking would amount to an aggravated contempt.

6. In that view of the matter, we dispose of this contempt petition.

[ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, J.]

[SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.]