



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO.208 OF 2025**

**IN**

**WRIT PETITION NO.1471 OF 2025 (D)**

**[Kailasrao Wadguji Arade ..Vrs.. Shri. Nitinkumar Hingole]**

---

*Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,  
appearances, Court's orders of directions  
and Registrar's orders.*

*Court's or Judge's order*

---

Shri. A. R. Ingole, Advocate for Petitioner.  
Shri. O. Deshpande, Advocate for Respondent.

**CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR AND  
RAJ D. WAKODE, JJ.**

**DATE : 13<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY, 2026.**

. In view of the order dated 2<sup>nd</sup> May, 2025, the present contempt petition came to be filed seeking relief to the effect that the respondent shall be punished for non-compliance of the above referred order. The order dated 2<sup>nd</sup> May, 2025, more particularly para 2 reads thus :

*“2. As we were about to direct the release of the vehicle, the learned AGP has submitted that the petitioner can appear before the SDO on 05/05/2025 by executing a bond and in case, if such bond is executed, the vehicle shall be released immediately. Statement is accepted.”*

2. In view of the said order, the S.D.O. has heard the petitioner on 5<sup>th</sup> May, 2025, and thereafter passed an order on 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2025, which is under challenge before the Collector in the proceedings namely Revenue Appeal.

3. No doubt, this Court directed the S.D.O. to release the vehicle upon submission of bond. However, it appears from the order dated 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2025, that earlier also a similar bond was submitted by the petitioner on 30<sup>th</sup> December, 2022, when his

vehicle was found transporting sand illegally without a transit pass. At the relevant time, the petitioner executed the bond of Rs.3 lakhs and since there was a breach of the said bond, the S.D.O., while passing the order dated 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2025, directed the petitioner to submit the another bond for release of the vehicle, which is till date not submitted by him.

4. The fact of earlier breach of bond was not brought to the notice of this Court while passing the order dated 2<sup>nd</sup> May, 2025. The said fact was, however, noticed by the S.D.O. and therefore, though this Court directed to release the vehicle, the S.D.O. asked the petitioner to furnish a bond for its release.

5. While following the aforesaid process, the S.D.O. cannot be said to have committed any willful disobedience of the directions issued by this Court, more particularly the directions issued on 2<sup>nd</sup> May, 2025.

6. Accordingly, the present contempt petition is dismissed.

(RAJ D. WAKODE, J.)      (ANIL S. KILOR, J.)