

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

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 592 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 4064 OF 2025**

Gajanan Govindrao Deshmukh & Anr. ... Petitioners
versus

K.H.Govindraj, the Principal Secretary
UD II for State of Maharashtra
Through the Urban Development Department & Ors. ... Respondents

...
Mr.Yatin M. Malvankar for the Petitioners.

Dr.Milind Sathe, Advocate General with Mrs.Neha Bhide, GP,
Mr.P.P.Kakade, Addl.GP and Mr. A.C.Bhadang, AGP for the Respondent -
State.

Dr.K.H.Govindraj, Additional Chief Secretary, Urban Development
Department is present.

Mr.Ajinkya Bagade, Deputy Secretary, Urban Development Department is
present.

Mr.Anilkumar R. Ugale, Under Secretary, Urban Development Department
is present.

...
**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.**

DATE : FEBRUARY 17, 2026

P.C:

1. The learned Advocate General of the State has addressed us.
He points out that the communication dated 09.02.2026 (wrongly typed as

2025) conveys the decision of the State Government, through the Desk Officer, addressed to both, the Corporation and the Petitioners. The proposal for seeking regularization has been rejected in accordance with the Rules of the Corporation. Since the representation was tendered by the Corporation, the proceedings undertaken were not under any particular statute. Since it was a pure representation, the concerned authorities, i.e Respondent Nos. 1 to 3, have considered the entire file pertaining to the representation and have taken a decision even upto the level of the Hon'ble Deputy Chief Minister of the State of Maharashtra, while rejecting the proposal of the Corporation.

2. In view of the above, in contempt proceedings, this Court cannot venture into assessing the quality or virtues of the order passed. If the representation, as directed by the Writ Order, has been considered and a decision has been arrived at, this Court has to only assess whether there was any willful, deliberate, and intentional disobedience of the Writ Order, coupled with whether the Respondents intended to overbear the authority of the Court.

3. The Writ Order dated 08.04.2025 directed Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 to decide the proposal sent by the Corporation dated 14.07.2023. The

decision was to be taken by any specific authority amongst Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.

4. The learned Advocate General has indicated from the file pertaining to the proposal that the same was considered and the State Government has arrived at the conclusion that the proposal cannot be entertained. He submits that the communication dated 09.02.2026 conveys the decision of the State that the proposal to equate the Petitioners with one Smt. Swapnali Chaudhary is not possible, and that the State cannot accept the proposal to absorb the present Petitioners into regular employment, as they were appointed during the COVID period.

5. In view of the above, the direction to consider the proposal has been implemented. Once a decision has been taken, in the absence of any ingredient to conclude that any of the Respondents deliberately, intentionally, or willfully disobeyed the Court, this Court cannot arrive at a conclusion that the order of the Writ Court has been disobeyed.

6. The affidavit-in-reply to this Petition dated 10.02.2026 reflects the stand of the Government, as narrated by the learned Advocate General. Respondent Nos. 1 to 3, are present in the Court.

7. Since we have concluded that the Respondents are not guilty of disobedience of the order, the notice issued to the Respondents stands purged. **This Contempt Petition is dismissed.**

(ABHAY J.MANTRI, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)