



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

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO.530 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.10147 OF 2019**

Neeta Tours & Travels

... Petitioner

Versus

Manisha Mhaiskar and Anr.

.... Respondents

Adv. Suhas S. Deokar a/w Adv. Tanmay M. Shembavanekar, for the
Petitioner.

Adv. Reshmarani Nathani, for Respondent No.2.

Mr. B. V. Samant, Addl.G.P a/w Smt. R. A. Salunkhe, AGP, for the
Respondent-State.

Mrs. Pradnya Walke, Dy. Sec. PWD, present in the Court.

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

DATE : 13th FEBRUARY, 2026

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. The Petitioner alleges the breach of the order dated 28th February 2024. By this order this Court has observed that if any parties are aggrieved by any notification in relation to any toll rates being specified for the minibuses, and if any representation is made, the same be considered by the appropriate authority and a reasoned decision in that regard be communicated to the

Petitioner within six weeks from the filing of the representation. Accordingly, the Petitioner filed a representation on 11th March 2024. There is a delay in deciding the representation.

3. Learned Additional Government Pleader invited our attention to the Notification dated 31st December 2024 regarding the rate of toll for a trip to be charged in respect of the motor vehicles stipulated in the Schedule. Learned Additional Government Pleader has placed on record a copy of the order dated 11th February 2026 which according to him decides the representation and the same is in compliance of the order passed by this Court.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the representation has been considered only from the standpoint of the grievance made by the Petitioner as regards the toll collection rates on the Sion Panvel Road. It is submitted that though the representation dated 11th March 2024 makes a grievance regarding the state highways and expressways, the decision only considers the grievance to the extent of the Sion Panvel State Highway.

5. We find that by a communication dated 11th February 2026, the Petitioner has been informed the decision on the

representation. We find that on the basis of the order passed by this Court, a reasoned order has been passed. This would amount to substantial compliance of the order passed by this Court. If the Petitioner has any grievance as regards the communication dated 11th February 2026, it is open for the Petitioner to file appropriate proceedings challenging such a decision. We make it clear that all contentions are kept open including the ones which are raised in the Civil Writ Petition No.10147 of 2019.

6. No doubt there is a delay in deciding the representation. Learned Additional Government Pleader submitted that the delay in deciding the representation is not deliberate or intentional. The Officer concerned is personally present in the Court. Since there is now a substantial compliance, no purpose will be served by considering the Contempt Petition any further.

7. The Contempt Petition is disposed of with the liberty.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)