

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

133 CONTEMPT PETITION STAMP NO.25462 OF 2016
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.2632 OF 2016

SADASHIV SITARAM MUNDHE
VERSUS
DATTATRAYA GANPATAPPA ITKE AND OTHERS

Advocate present.

CORAM: VIJAY S.KULKARNI
REGISTRAR (JUDL)

DATED: 09/01/2017

1. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner. The objection notified by the office is that respondent nos.2 & 3 are not party in W.P.No.2632 of 2016 and therefore, party made in present contempt petition to respondent nos.2 & 3 is not permissible. The learned Advocate argued that respondent no.2 is the intervenor in W.P.No.2632/2016 and also the Chairman of Jawahar Education Society and respondent no.3 is the appointing authority who is Principal. It is argued that respondent no.3 is acted on the directions and instructions given by respondent no.2 and therefore, they are contemnor and necessary parties to the present contempt petition. In view of the submission made by the learned Advocate and role attributed to respondent nos.2 & 3, I find substance in the submission made by the learned Advocate and to hold that the objection is not sustainable. In the result, I proceed to pass following order.

ORDER

The objection notified by the office regarding respondent nos.2 & 3 is hereby waived. Matter to proceed.

REGISTRAR (JUDL)