MAYUR KONDIRAM ADANE
Digitally signed by MAYUR KONDIRAM ADANE
Date: 2026.08.19 17:16:00 +0530

Mayur

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 611 OF 2025

Mukund Jaisingh Utekar & Ors ...Petitioners

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra Thr Secretary Medical Education And Drugs Department & Ors ...Respondents

---

Mr. R.S. Upadhay, for the Petitioners.
Mr. A.R. Deolekar, AGP, for the Respondent-State.

CORAM: SUMAN SHYAM &
ADVAIT M. SETHNA, JJ.

DATED: 17th AUGUST 2026.

PC:-

1. This Contempt Petition has been filed alleging willful disobedience of the order dated 28th February 2025 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 10793 of 2022, whereby, the order of the MAT dated 14th February 2022 passed in Original Application No. 756 of 2020 has been affirmed, thus maintaining the original order passed by the learned Tribunal issuing a direction for regularization of the service of the original Applicants/Petitioners.

2. Mr. Deolekar, learned AGP, by referring to the additional reply filed on behalf of the Respondents, submits that the Government has already issued Government Resolution dated 28th

February 2026, for implementing the Court order, thus regularizing the services of the Petitioners. Therefore, nothing further survives in the Contempt Petition.

3. Responding to the above submission, Mr. Upadhay, learned counsel for the Petitioners, submits that although the services of his clients have been regularized, effect has not been given to the same from the date on which they started working under the Respondents, as temporary employees. However, on a pointed query made by this Court, Mr. Upadhay, in his usual fairness, has submitted that such a direction was not specifically issued by this Court making it mandatory for the Respondents to give retrospective effect to the order of regularization. If that be so, in our considered opinion, the aforesaid issue cannot be agitated in this Contempt Petition.

4. We, therefore, close the Contempt Petition by granting liberty to the Petitioners to agitate the above issue, in an appropriate proceedings, if so advised. We further make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion on the merit of the claim of the Petitioners regarding retrospective benefit of regularization of their services.

(ADVAIT M. SETHNA, J.) (SUMAN SHYAM, J.)