

URMILA
PRAMOD
INGALE

Digitally
signed by
URMILA
PRAMOD
INGALE
Date:
2026.02.06
10:34:45
+0530

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 165 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 1600 OF 2022**

Yashoda w/o Nageshwar Satdive ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Maharashtra and ors. Respondents

Mr. Prabhakar Ranshur a/w Mr. Shahadev K., for the Petitioner.
Mr. Ashwin Vasista, for the Respondent No.3.
Mr. Girish Paryani, for University of Mumbai.
Mr. B.V. Samant, Addl. GP a/w Smt. P.J.Gavhane, AGP for
Respondent-State.

**CORAM : M.S.KARNIK &
S.M.MODAK, JJ.**

DATE : 04th FEBRUARY 2026

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the contempt petitioner. This contempt petition is filed alleging breach of the order dated 09/12/2022 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 1600 of 2022. The order reads thus :

“1. The contentions of Mr. Gaware, learned counsel for the petitioner that respondent no. 3 is grant-in-aid institution and as such writ is maintainable.

2. In the aforesaid background, the claim of the petitioner is for grant of compassionate appointment at the place of her late husband-Nageshwar Satdive.

3. We direct the Respondent No. 3 to decide the claim of the petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment as expeditiously as possible and in accordance with law
4. The petition stands disposed of.”

2. We therefore find that by the order by which the breach is alleged, respondent no.3 was directed to decide the claim of the petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment as expeditiously as possible and in accordance with law. By a communication dated 30/08/2023 which is annexed at page 78 of the contempt petition, it is fairly pointed out by the petitioner that respondent no.3 had offered a job as Manual Assistant (Non-Clerical) on a consolidated monthly salary of Rs.12,500/- per month. The petitioner was called upon to join immediately but not later than 11/09/2023 failing which it would be construed that the petitioner is not interested in taking up the assignment. The petitioner was to be on probation for a period of 12 months.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that pursuant to the demise of her husband, the petitioner has to maintain the family comprising herself and two children and it would be very difficult to survive on the salary of Rs. 12,000/- per month. It is submitted that her husband was paid salary of Rs.30,000/-

4. Learned counsel for respondent no.3 on instructions submits that they are still willing to stand by the offer letter dated 30/08/2023 in deference to what is suggested by this Court. Apart from this, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent no.3 is also willing to take the responsibility of the education of two children provided that they take admission in the school run by respondent no.3-Management.

5. It is always open for the petitioner to approach the respondent no.3 in this regard. However, so far as this contempt petition is concerned, we are satisfied that there is no deliberate breach of the order passed by this Court and that the order stands sufficiently complied with. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the action of respondent no. 3 issuing the communication dated 30/08/2023, it is open for the petitioner to take recourse to appropriate remedies in accordance with law. Keeping this liberty open, the contempt petition is disposed of.

(S.M.MODAK, J.)

(M.S.KARNIK, J.)