

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 20 OF 2026

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 401 OF 2011

Awadesh Balbir Pal

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

... Respondents

Petitioner-in-person.

Mr. Prashant Kamble, AGP for the Respondent-State.

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

DATED : 18th JUNE, 2026.

P.C. :

1. Heard petitioner-in-person. The petitioner alleges breach of the Order dated 8th June, 2011 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 401 of 2011. The Order reads thus:-

“The substratum of the grievance of the Petitioner is that the Chief Executive Officer of the Slum Rehabilitation Authority has not passed any order in compliance with the directions issued by the High Power Committee on 18 April 2009. By its order of 18 April 2009, the High Power Committee had permitted the Petitioner to submit a representation before the Chief Executive Officer of the Slum Rehabilitation Authority, who was directed to look into the grievance of the Petitioner and to pass appropriate orders expeditiously. During the course of the hearing of these proceedings, Counsel appearing on behalf of the Fourth Respondent has placed on the record a copy of the order dated 5 April 2011, passed by the Chief Executive Officer of the Slum Rehabilitation Authority in pursuance of the directions issued by the High Power Committee on 18 April 2009. In that view of the matter, this petition is rendered infructuous. If the Petitioner

has any other subsisting grievance in respect of the order passed by the Chief Executive Officer of the Slum Rehabilitation Authority, it would be open to him to adopt proceedings in accordance with law. The Petition is accordingly dismissed.”

2. The petitioner-in-person submits that this Court has specifically observed that if the petitioner has any subsisting grievance in respect of the order passed by the Chief Executive Officer, it would be open for him to adopt proceedings in accordance with law. It is therefore submitted that the petitioner had approached this Court by way of contempt petition as the authorities are not performing their duties in accordance with the provisions of law.

3. Mr. Reddy, learned counsel for the respondent-SRA raised an objection that apart from the contempt petition being misconceived, the proceedings are hopelessly barred by limitation, the same having been filed after 13 years.

4. In our view, the present contempt petition completely misconceived. The present contempt petition is filed on a complete misreading of the observations of this Court. Even if the petitioner has any subsisting grievance, the remedy cannot be by way of a contempt petition. As we find that there is absolutely no breach of the Order dated 8th June, 2011, the contempt petition is therefore rejected.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)