



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.324 OF 2025

IN

WRIT PETITION NO.120 OF 2025 (D)

RAJESH RAIBHAN MADAME

VERSUS

SANJAY BARDE, GENEREAL MANAGER, BHANDARA DISTRICT
COOPERATIVE BANK LTD, BHANDARA AND ANOTHER

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders
--	---------------------------

Mr. Parth Malviya, Advocate for Petitioner.

Mr. O.A. Ghare, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

CORAM : PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.

DATED : 10th FEBRUARY 2026

PER COURT :-

1. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner.
2. By this petition, the petitioner prays for initiating contempt action against the respondents for deliberate non compliance with the order dated 10.03.2025, passed by this Court, in Writ Petition No.120 of 2025, by which a direction was issued to the respondents Bank to consider and decide the case of the respondent employee (petitioner herein) for promotion in terms of judgment and order dated 10.04.2012, passed by Industrial Court, Bhandara, in Complaint (ULP) No.06 of 2008.

3. The grievance of the petitioner is despite a specific direction by this Court to consider and decide the issue about the promotion within eight weeks from the order dated 10.03.2025, same was not decided and therefore, the respondents have committed contempt of the said order passed by this Court.

4. In response to the notice issued to the General Manager and Chairman of Bhandara District Central Co-operative Bank, Advocate Mr. Ghare, appears and submits that, in fact, the decision on the said issue about the promotion of the employee was already taken on 17.05.2025 and a copy of the said communication is handed over to the Advocate for the respondent (petitioner herein) yesterday i.e. on 09.02.2026. He, therefore, submits that the respondents have in fact complied with the judgment and order passed by this Court and therefore, there is no contempt.

5. Learned Advocate for the petitioner states that the said decision was not communicated to the petitioner and in this regard, invites attention to the notice dated 01.07.2025, issued on behalf of the petitioner to the respondents, alleging willful disobedience and contempt of the order passed by this Court. He submits that, despite service of this notice, the respondents have not intimated the petitioner about any order or decision dated 17.05.2025. He submits

that the petitioner is entitled to challenge the said order and on account of the delay in communication, the petitioner need not be required to suffer. In view of the fact that the respondents have taken a decision on the issue of promotion of the employee in terms of the order dated 10.03.2025, passed in Writ Petition No.120 of 2025, it cannot be concluded that there is willful disobedience on the part of the respondents and the contempt proceedings are therefore dropped.

6. Having regard to this, it is clarified that if any proceedings are initiated by the petitioner for challenging the order/decision dated 17.05.2025, an application for condonation of delay, if any, be decided by considering the fact that the petitioner was communicated the order/decision on 09.02.2026.

7. In view of the above, the contempt petition is disposed of.

(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.)

asd