

(1)

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO.655 OF 2017  
IN  
WRIT PETITION NO.4900 OF 2016**

Dhanraj Vedu Rawandale & ors ..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & ors. ..RESPONDENTS

**WITH  
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.657 OF 2017  
IN  
WRIT PETITION NO.4902 OF 2016**

Dinkar Fakira Wani & ors ..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & ors. ..RESPONDENTS

**WITH  
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.658 OF 2017  
IN  
WRIT PETITION NO.4899 OF 2016**

Madhav Natha Mali & ors ..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & ors. ..RESPONDENTS

**WITH  
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.660 OF 2017  
IN  
WRIT PETITION NO.4901 OF 2016**

Dinkar Anantrao Patil ..PETITIONER

(2)

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & ors.

..RESPONDENTS

Mr Ashwin V. Hon, Advocate for petitioners;  
Mr C.S. Kulkarni, A.G.P. for respondents/State;  
Mr S.P. Shah, Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 & 3

**WITH  
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.659 OF 2017  
IN  
WRIT PETITION NO.4680 OF 2016**

Girdhar Govindrao Desle

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & ors.

..RESPONDENTS

Mr Ashwin V. Hon, Advocate for petitioner;  
Mr C.S. Kulkarni, A.G.P. for respondents/State;  
Mr A. G. Talhar, Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 & 3

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE  
AND  
MANISH PITALE, JJ.**

**DATE : 21st August, 2018**

**ORAL ORDER:**

Heard Mr. Hon, learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners. He invited our attention to the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court in a bunch of writ petitions, namely, Writ Petition No. 4899 of 2016 and other connected writ petitions.

2. Mr Hon then submitted that simple notice was issued by this Court Court on 13th November, 2017.

(3)

3. Mr Shah, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent Nos.2 and 3 made an attempt to submit before us that the petitioners may not be entitled to receive these benefits because their service record fails to show that they are having adequate earned leave at their credit. He further submitted that this contention was raised in one of the petitions. Thus, the attempt of Mr Shah is to make submission on the merits of the order passed by this Court leading us to take an exercise to assess the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court which in no case we can undertake.

4. Mr Shah then submits that some attempts have been made to settle the matters amicably and certain proposal by way of offer is submitted to the petitioners and it is under their consideration. Mr Hon, learned Counsel for the petitioners, on instructions, denies of any such proposal or offer being made by respondent Nos.2 and 3.

5. Without going into that dispute, we direct respondent Nos.2 and 3 to make a positive statement before this Court insofar as compliance of the order of this Court within a period of two weeks from today. If respondent Nos.2 and 3 are unable to make such statement before this Court within two weeks, they are directed to remain present personally before this Court on the next date of hearing.

(4)

6. Post the petitions for further consideration on 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2018. We further make it clear that if respondents are having any grievance against the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court, they are not left remediless.

7. Mr Talhar, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent Nos.2 and 3 in Contempt Petition No.659 of 2017 prays time of two weeks as a last chance to make a positive statement before this Court. At the request of Mr Talhar, two weeks time is granted as a last chance.

Stand over to 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2018.

**(MANISH PITALE, J.)**

**(PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.)**

sjk