



vinita

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO.6 OF 2026
WITH
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.1007 OF 2025 (F)**

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.6 OF 2026

SIDDHARTH S. SHIRODKAR AND ANR ... PETITIONERS
Versus
SURYAJIRAO V. RANE AND ANR ... RESPONDENTS

WITH

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.1007 OF 2025 (F)

SIDDHARTH SHIVNATH SHIRODKAR ... PETITIONERS
Versus
STATE OF GOA, THR CHIEF SECRETARY
AND 4 ORS ... RESPONDENT

Ms Smita Gawas, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr Shirin Naik and Mr A. Tari, Advocate for Respondent No.3.

**CORAM:- SUMAN SHYAM &
AMIT S. JAMSANDEKAR, JJ.**

DATED :- 23rd February, 2026

P.C.

Heard Ms. Gawas, learned Counsel for the Petitioners.

2. Mr. Naik, learned Counsel for the Respondent no.3 has tendered affidavit which is taken on record. He submits that on 17.2.2026 and 18.2.2026, in total, 24 proceedings have been disposed of which includes the proceedings of the Petitioners. Therefore, the order dated 12.6.2026 of this Court has been complied with.

3. In so far as the delay in completing the process is concerned, it has been stated in the reply that since the Respondent no. 3 was given additional charge as Chief Officer of Valpoi Municipal Council and in

view of the ongoing election process and SIR exercise, wherein he was entrusted with additional duties, there was some delay in completing the process.

4. The Petitioners' Counsel has, however, questioned the above stand of the Respondent No.3 by urging this Court to initiate Contempt Proceedings against him. However, what is to be borne in mind is that action for contempt of Court can be initiated only when there is wilful disobedience of the Court order and not merely on account of delay in implementing the order due to any bonafide reason.

5. Considering the explanation furnished by the Respondent No.3 in the affidavit, we are of the view that the delay was not on account of any wilful negligence on the part of the Respondent no.3. Therefore, by taking note of the submissions made in the reply, we are not inclined to proceed against the Respondent No.3 in the contempt case, any further.

6. However, since the copy of the order has not yet been furnished by the Respondent no. 3, we make it clear that if a certified copy of the order is applied for by the Petitioners, the same shall be furnished to them as expeditiously as possible but not later than a week from the date of receipt of the application.

7. With the above observations, this Contempt Petition stands disposed of.

AMIT S. JAMSANDEKAR, J.

SUMAN SHYAM, J.