



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

927 CONT. PETITION NO. 168 OF 2026
IN WP/1064/2026

VARSHATAI VIJAY SHINDE
VERSUS
SHAIKH HUSEN DADABHAI

.....
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Shaikh Mazhar Abdulhamid
.....

CORAM : Y.G. KHOBRAGADE, J.
DATE : 02.04.2026

PC.:-

1. Heard advocate Mr. Shaikh the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner at length.
2. By the resent petition, the petitioner has invoked the jurisdiction of this Court under the Contempt of Courts Act and put-forth prayer clause-A and B as under:

“A) To issue notice of contempt to the respondents in accordance with the Contempt of Court Act, 1971, for wilful disobedience of the order dated 29-01-2026 passed by this Hon’ble Court in writ petition no.1064 of 2026;

B) To punish the respondents in accordance with the provisions of Contempt of Court Act, 1961, for wilful disobedience of the order dated 29-01-2026 passed by this Hon’ble Court in writ petition No.1064 of 2026;”

3. Needless to say that, on 29.01.2026 this Court (Coram: S.G. Chapalgaonkar, J.) passed the following order in Writ Petition No.1064/2026:

“1. Heard.

2. Issue notice to the Respondents, returnable on 17.3.2026. learned AGP waives notice for respondent nos.1 to 3.

3. Till the returnable date, no coercive steps shall be taken against petitioner in pursuance to the impugned notice issued to petitioner by the Deputy Superintendent of Land Records, Shrirampur.

4. If any adverse order is already passed against the petitioner that shall be subject to final outcome of this writ petition.”

4. After going through the said order, it appears that till the returnable date no coercive action was to be taken against the petitioner in pursuance of the notice which was subject matter of the petition issued to the petitioner by the Dy. Superintendent of Land Records, Shrirampur (present respondent no.2). However, if any adverse order is already passed against the petitioner then it shall be subject to the outcome of the said writ petition.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner canvassed that, on 30.01.2026 the respondent no.2 passed the final order in respect of notice issued to the petitioner which was subject matter of writ petition no.1064/2026 and directed for taking mutation entries in the name of

respondent no.1 pertaining to CT survey no.1838, wherein, the application of the respondent no.1 was allowed and the mutation entry no.55 dated 22.06.1992 and 23.07.2007 and mutation no.9724 dated 30.06.2016 were cancelled and directed the Surveyor, Shrirampur to submit the proposal for said approval.

6. It is further contended that, the petitioner has communicated said order dated 29.01.2026 to the respondent no.2 in spite of said fact the respondent no.2 passed an order on 30.01.2026. Therefore, it has been submitted that since this Court passed an order in writ petition no.1064/2026 on 29.01.2026 and the respondent no.2 passed an order on 30.01.2026 cancelling the mutation entries, there is breach of the said order passed by this Court at the hands of the respondent no.2. Further, on 02.02.2026 the respondent no.1 made a communication to the respondent no.2 and requested for cancellation of the mutation entry pertaining to land C.T. survey no.1838 of Shrirampur City, therefore, there is willful disobedience of order dated 29.01.2026 by the respondents. However, it is submitted that as per the order dated 29.01.2026 passed by this Court in writ petition no.1064/2026 the respondent no.2- Superintendent of Land Records was directed not to take coercive action in pursuance of the notice served upon the petitioner and if any adverse order is already passed in that event the said order would be

subject to final outcome of the said writ petition. Therefore, the petitioner is having remedy to amend the writ petition no.1064/2026 and raised the grievance about passing of final order dated 30.01.2026 by the respondent no.2/Superintendent of Land Records.

7. In view of above, I do not find that the petitioner has made out substantial grounds to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court under the Contempt of Courts Act, so also, it does not appear that there is any willful disobedience of the order dated 29.01.2026 passed by this Court in writ petition no.1064/2026 by the respondents.

8. Hence, the contempt petition is dismissed.

[Y.G. KHOBRADE, J.]