



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONTEMPT PETITION (STAMP) NO.7086 OF 2026

Shreya Sitaram Jinkwad

Versus

The State of Maharashtra Through its Secretary and another

...

Mr. Vishal Ghanswadh h/f Mr. Mohnish Thorat, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. S. K. Tambe, AGP for respondents/State.

...

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &

HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.

DATE : 27 MARCH 2026

ORDER :

. Not on board. Upon mentioning, matter is taken on board.

2. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the petition was wrongly filed even before the period within which the respondents were to comply with the order. It is a sorry state of affair that in spite of having knowledge about the order and the condition stipulated therein the petitioner has hurriedly filed the contempt petition. The purpose for which such petitions are filed are to punish the erring officers or the respondents against whom the orders are passed. Not only the respondents should obey the order, but it is the reciprocal responsibility on the petitioner to wait for the compliance thereof and allow the respondents to take the action within the period of limitation. We would

have imposed heavy cost on the petitioner, however, upon query, learned Advocate for the petitioner take upon himself the wrong and submits that his standing at the bar is only one year. We give him advise to be careful in future and take the guidance of the seniors, if necessary.

3. Now, the learned Advocate for the petitioner is also seeking liberty to approach this Court, if the order is not complied with.

4. We leave the point open regarding whether second Contempt Petition would be maintainable after the withdrawal of the first, to be agitated, if at all, the second petition is filed in the event of non compliance.

5. With these observations, the contempt petition stands disposed of.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm