



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

1 CONT. PETITION NO. 874 OF 2025
IN WP/10869/2024

JAGANNATH VIKRAM GHUGE

VERSUS

SMT MINNU P S

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Shivkumar K Mathpati

AGP/APP for Respondent/State : Mr. S.P. Sonpawale

Advocate for Respondent No.1 and 2 : Mr. Suryawanshi Prashant D.

...

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

DATE : 02.02.2026

PER COURT :

. Pursuant to our earlier order dated 17.01.2026, the Chief Executive Officer of respondent No.1/Zilla Parishad is present before us.

2. This Contempt Petition is arising out of an order passed by this Court on 03.10.2024 in Writ Petition No.10869 of 2024. The above order of which this Contempt Petition arises reads thus :

“1. All these Petitioners claim to have received their District Awards prior to 12.12.2000. The details read as under

Chart in respect of details of Petitioners name, date of appointments, date of retirement and date of District Award :-

Sr.No.	Name of the Petitioners	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Date of District Award
01	Namdev Asaram Gaikwad	16.11.1973	30.06.2011	1997-1998
02	Neela Dattatray Tarakh	05.04.1979	31.12.2016	1995-1996
03	Minaxi Sudhakar Rao Rakhe	11.12.1973	30.11.2004	1998-1999

04	Jagannath Vikram Ghughe	30.06.1971	31.03.2007	1994-1995
05	Shrikrishna Babasaheb Tarakh	11.01.1974	31.08.2011	1994-1995

2. In this Petition, the Petitioners are identically placed. All of them received the District Teachers Award prior to 12.12.2000. In several matters, this Court has concluded that "the Respondent Zilla Parishad, after confirming itself of the Petitioner being a District Awardee Teacher prior to 04.09.2018, prior to his retirement, shall consider the case of the Petitioner for additional increment as laid down in the circular dated 12.12.2000. It is made clear that the Petitioner will not be entitled for actual monetary benefits till the date of his retirement. The additional increment shall be counted notionally. The benefit shall be given to the Petitioner for pension purpose." (WP Nos. 12519/2019 and 9414/2021]. The learned Advocate for the Petitioners submits that the Petitioners are satisfied if the above order is made applicable to their cases."

3. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1 and 2 has filed an affidavit in reply alongwith a communication dated 7/22.01.2026 annexed therewith showing that respondent Nos. 1 and 2 have complied with the said directions.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner however contends that the monetary benefits pursuant to the said order has not been paid.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent Nos.1 and 2 submits that they are pursuing the government for release of said monetary benefits and the same are likely to be released within a period of six months from today, so that the same could be paid to the petitioner.

6. In that view of the matter, the Contempt Petition stands disposed of.

(ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, J.)

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.)

vsj..