

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

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 91 OF 2025
IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 2490 OF 2018

Anita Shyamrao Deshmukh & Ors.

.. Petitioners

Versus

State of Maharashtra & Ors.

.. Respondents

WITH

INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO. 16658 OF 2026

IN

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 91 OF 2025

Adv. Sripad Ramdasi for the Petitioner.

Adv. Prakhar Tandon i/b Adv. Gaurav Patankar for Respondent No.2.

Adv. Prakash Chavan a/w Adv. Jyoti Mhatre i/b Adv. Komal Punjabi for Respondent Nos. 4 & 5/BMC.

Ms. Jyoti Chavan- AGP with Mr. Himanshu Takke-AGP for State.

CORAM: SUMAN SHYAM &

FIRDOSH P POONIWALLA, JJ.

DATE: 7th MAY, 2026

P C.

1. Heard Mr. Sripad Ramdasi learned counsel for the Petitioner. Also heard Mr. Adv. Prakhar Tandon learned counsel appearing for the Respondent No. 2. In terms of the Order dated 28th April, 2026, the Respondent No.2 Mr. Pritesh Damji Savla as well as Purandar K. Shetty are personally present before this Court. This contempt case has been filed alleging wilful dis-

obedience of the Order dated 19th September, 2018 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 2490/2018 wherein the present Petitioners were the Writ Petitioners. The operative part of the Order dated 19th September, 2018 is reproduced herein below :-

“3. The learned counsel for the respondent no.4 handed over four Demand Drafts to the learned counsel for the petitioners towards the compensation amount. Within one week, the respondent no.4 will give a draft agreement to the petitioners and thereafter within two weeks the agreement will be executed.”

2. Mr. Tandon, the learned counsel for Respondent No.2 submits that on 27th of April 2026, the agreement has been executed by the parties whereafter, the Petitioners have also been put in possession of their respective flats. Therefore the Order of this Court had been fully complied with. In his attempt to explain the delay in complying with the court's order, Mr. Tandon has given explanations to support his contention that this is not a case of wilful delay. We have taken note of the explanation so furnished by the learned counsel for Respondent No.2. Since, the Order of this Court has already been complied with, we do not find any justifiable ground to keep this contempt case pending. The contempt case is accordingly, closed.

(FIRDOSH P POONIWALLA, J.)

(SUMAN SHYAM, J.)