

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 809 OF 2025

Rajeev D. Tamhankar

... Petitioner

Versus

Principal Secretary, Water Resources Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai

... Respondent

Ms. Shruti Tulpule for the Petitioner.

Mr. N. C. Walimbe, Addl GP a/w. Smt. R. M. Shinde, AGP for the Respondent.

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

DATED : **8th APRIL, 2026.**

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. We have perused the Order dated 19th January, 2026. In the Order dated 19th January, 2026, the communication dated 16th January, 2026 addressed by the State of Maharashtra to the learned AGP was referred. In the said communication, learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that the State of Maharashtra has assured that the amount of Rs.5,67,687/- in terms of the Order dated 2nd April, 2025 would be paid over.
3. It is now the grievance of the petitioner that what has been paid to the petitioner is only Rs.4,82,666/- and not the amount of Rs.5,67,687/- as reflected in the communication dated 16th January, 2026.

4. Having perused the communication dated 16th January, 2026, it is apparent that it is on the submission of the petitioner that the total amount due and payable to the petitioner as on 31st November, 2025 that this amount of Rs.5,67,687/- is reflected. In such view of the matter, the State of Maharashtra had issued such directions for the deposit. On calculation by the concerned department, learned AGP found it was noticed that the arrears due and payable in terms of Order dated 2nd April, 2025 is Rs.4,82,666/-. The amount mentioned in the communication cannot bind the respondents. The amount of Rs.4,82,666/- has been paid to the petitioner.

5. We therefore find that there is substantial compliance of the Order passed by this Court in these circumstances. If the petitioner still has dispute regarding the calculations, it is open for the petitioner to resort to appropriate proceedings seeking appropriate reliefs. However, it is not possible for us in this Contempt Petition to issue any further directions as we are satisfied that the Order passed by this Court dated 2nd April, 2025 stands substantially complied with.

6. Keeping that liberty open, the Contempt Petition is disposed of.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)