

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 413 OF 2026
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 1983 OF 2023**

Ashok Gangadhar Puranik and another ... Petitioners
vs.
The State of Maharashtra and others ... Respondents

Mr. Girish Godbole, Senior Advocate, i/b. Ms. Sapna Rachure for petitioners.

Mr. G. S. Hegde, Senior Advocate, a/w. Mr. Arafat Siddique, Mr. Soham Bhalerao and Mr. Arnav Ashtikar, i/b. DSK Legal for respondent – CIDCO.

Ms. S. D. Vyas, Addl. GP a/w. Ms. M. S. Bane, AGP for all the respondents – State authorities.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE &
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ**

DATE : 06th AUGUST, 2026

P.C. :

. Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioners, learned AGP for the officers of the respondents – State authorities and the learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the officers of the City and Industrial Development Corporation of Maharashtra Limited (CIDCO).

2. Having heard the submissions and upon perusal of documents on record, we find that the respondents have failed to abide by the specific directions issued in the judgement and order dated 26.11.2024 passed by a Division Bench of this Court (Coram: G. S. Kulkarni & Somasekhar Sundaresan, JJ) in Writ Petition No.1983 of 2023 (the said judgement and order). By the said judgement and order, Writ Petition Nos.7604 of 2018 and 10264 of 2023 were also

disposed of. But, the petitioners herein are really concerned with the positive direction issued by the Division Bench in Writ Petition No.1983 of 2023.

3. The operative portion of the said order reads as follows:

“32. In the result, we dispose of the Writ Petitions in terms of the following order:-

a) Writ Petition No. 1983 of 2023, filed by Atul and Ashok, seeking the quashing of the State’s demand for a refund of the advance compensation is hereby allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a), (b) and (b1), which read thus:

‘a. That this Hon'ble Court be pleased to issue a writ of certiorari or a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing the Respondent Nos.1 to 5 to forthwith withdraw impugned communications dated 8th October, 2021 (Exhibits "T" and "U") and 1st October, 2021 (being Exhibit-"V"), letter dated 11th November 2021 (being Exhibit-"X"), Letter dated 20th January, 2022 issued by the Respondent No.2 (being Exhibit-"BB"), and Letter dated 25th January, 2022 issued by Respondent No.4 and Mutation entry No.1349 dated 18th February, 2022 by Respondent no.5 (being Exhibit-"AA");

b. That this Hon'ble Court be pleased to issue a writ of certiorari or a writ in the nature of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction calling for the records and proceedings in respect of acquisition of the said land in which the impugned letters came to be issued, and after going into the legality thereof, to quash and/or set aside the impugned communications 8th October, 2021 issued by Respondent No.2 (Exhibits “T” and “U”) and 1st October, 2021 issued by Respondent No. 3 (being Exhibit- “V”), Letter dated 11th November, 2021 (being Exhibit- “X”) letter dated 20th January, 2022 issued by the Respondent No.2 (being Exhibit- “BB”), and

Letter dated 25th January, 2022 issued by Respondent No.4 and Mutation entry No.1349 dated 18th February, 2022 by Respondent no.5 (being Exhibit-"AA");

- b1. This Hon'ble Court be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus and/or any other Writ/Order/Direction in the nature of mandamus and thereby be pleased to direct the Respondent No.2 to complete the acquisition proceedings in respect of land bearing S. No. 59/8 Village Asudgaon, Taluka Panvel, District Raigad by taking necessary steps within a period of three months.'
- b) As regards prayer clause (b2), the Collector is directed to compute the balance compensation due and payable to the land owners along with applicable interest in terms of the 2013 Act, and pay the same within a period of six weeks from today;
- c) Writ Petition No. 7604 of 2018, filed by Ranjit, seeking, among others, the quashing of the acquisition of the Subject Property, is hereby dismissed;
- d) Writ Petition No. 10264 of 2023, filed by Ranjit, seeking to quash the acquisition of the Subject Property, and asking for handing over of possession of the Subject Property to the Court Receiver, despite the explicit findings of this Court that the Court Receiver was discharged, is hereby dismissed;
- e) The amounts deposited in this Court in Writ Petition No.1983 of 2023 towards compensation payable to the land owners in respect of the Subject Property alongwith all accruals thereon shall stand released to the land owners in proportion to their entitlements immediately upon the expiry of two weeks from today;
- f) Ranjit shall pay costs in the sum of Rs. 5 lakh to each of Ashok and Atul within a period of two weeks from today;
- g) The Chief Secretary, Government of Maharashtra shall direct an enquiry to be conducted by an appropriate Principal Secretary, to fix accountability for the manner of conduct of the acquisition proceedings and the proceedings in this Court, by

various State authorities and for continuing to file affidavits invoking the purported possession of the Subject Property by the Court Receiver despite the cogent and clear findings by this Court in disposal of the Contempt Petition (Stamp) No. 197 of 2019, and in disregard of the multiple orders of multiple benches of this Court expressing displeasure over the manner in which affidavits have been filed in these proceedings.

33. Rule is made absolute in the aforesaid terms. Disposed of. As a result, nothing would survive in any Interim Applications filed in any of the three Writ Petitions, all of which are also stand finally disposed of.
34. Although these Petitions are disposed of, they shall be listed for reporting compliance six months from today.
35. At this stage, Mr. Thorat, learned Counsel for the Petitioner in Writ Petition No.10264 of 2023, Writ Petition No. 7604 of 2018 and for Intervenor in Interim Application No.7681 of 2023 prays for stay of our aforesaid direction. Considering the facts of the case, request for stay is rejected.
36. All actions required pursuant to this judgement and order shall be taken upon receipt of a downloaded copy of this judgement and order as published on this Court's website."

4. In terms of clause (b) of the above-quoted operative portion of the order, the respondent – Collector was directed to compute the balance amount of compensation payable to the petitioners along with applicable interest in terms of The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, and to pay the same within a period of six weeks from the date of order. Since the acquisition was undertaken for the benefit of respondent – CIDCO, it appears that according to the respondent – State authorities, the amount was required to be deposited by respondent – CIDCO with the respondent – State

authorities, particularly the Collector and then, the same could be disbursed to the petitioners.

5. We find substance in the contention raised on behalf of the petitioners that the same could, at best, be treated as an internal arrangement, but compliance with the abovementioned positive direction within stipulated period of time, was necessary.

6. Reply affidavits have been filed on behalf of the respondents. It has come to light that one of the private parties i.e. one Mr. Ranjit Anand Puranik had filed Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.29789 – 29791 of 2024 before the Supreme Court, challenging the said judgement and order. By an order dated 13.12.2024, the Supreme Court dismissed the same *in limine*, thereby confirming the said judgment and order of this Court.

7. It is also an admitted position that the respondent – CIDCO also filed Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.6040 of 2025 before the Supreme Court, challenging the said judgement and order. On 28.04.2025, the same was withdrawn and liberty was granted to the said respondent to apply to this Court for review of the said judgement and order.

8. Accordingly, Review Petition No.142 of 2025 was filed by respondent – CIDCO in Writ Petition No.1983 of 2023. By an order dated 03.07.2026, the same was dismissed.

9. Reply affidavits and documents placed on record show that in the interregnum, on 08.04.2025, the Deputy Collector, Land Acquisition, Metro Centre No.1, Panvel, passed an award

determining the compensation payable to the petitioners. Thereafter, the said authority appears to have communicated with respondent – CIDCO for depositing the quantum of compensation so determined. It is an admitted position that the said respondent has not deposited the said amount with the Deputy Collector, in terms of the said award dated 08.04.2025. As a consequence, despite the positive direction issued in the said judgement and order, to compute and pay the balance amount of compensation to the petitioners within six weeks from the date of order, the same has not been paid till date. It appears that the respondents – officers of the State are trying to blame the respondent – CIDCO, as the said respondent has failed to deposit the amount with the Collector.

10. While considering the submissions made on behalf of rival parties, we noticed scathing observations made in the said judgment and order and particularly, in the order dated 03.07.2026 passed by the Division Bench, dismissing the review petition. A perusal of the contents of the said orders indeed gives an impression that the respondents, particularly the officers of the CIDCO, appear to have adopted an obstinate approach to somehow wriggle out of the liability of payment of compensation to the petitioners and from abiding by the positive direction issued in the said judgement and order, for payment of compensation within six weeks from the date of order.

11. In paragraph Nos.36 and 37 of the order dated 03.07.2026, while dismissing the review petition, this Court observed as follows:

“36. Indeed, the synopsis in CIDCO’s Special Leave Petition refers to WP 11835, which was Ranjit’s Writ Petition as being its own Writ Petition – clearly

indicating a verbatim reproduction of Ranjit's failed Special Leave Petition. This was nothing but a second bite at the cherry, and it cannot be forgotten that Ranjit's resourcefulness was commented upon and led to imposition of costs, which have also not been disturbed. Indeed, the file name for CIDCO's Special Leave Petition is named 'Ranjit Anand Puranik.PDF'. A holistic view of all the foregoing factors is a reasonable pointer to the Review Petition not only being a misadventure but also an abuse of the process of law, with nothing new to show and no error apparent on the face of the record to show to necessitate a review.

37. It is also telling that it is after the issuance of notice in Contempt Petition (Stamp) No. 5796 of 2025 and the Contempt Petition 11956 to the Managing Director of CIDCO that the Special Leave Petition that had been filed and kept under defects was circulated. The fact that Ranjit's lawyers received notice of the inspection conducted by CIDCO and participated in the inspection when Ranjit was not a party to CS 339 is also telling. Ranjit's father Anand was a party and there are other heirs of Anand against whom Ranjit has a claim – a 60% share in Anand's share. It is remarkable that none of them was then identified and given notice of inspection in the manner Ranjit was (if CIDCO was keen to ensure fairness to Anand's legal heirs)."

12. The only submission made on behalf of respondent – CIDCO before this Court today is that the said respondent is contemplating filing special leave petition against the said order dated 03.07.2026 passed by the Division Bench of this Court, dismissing the review petition of the said respondent.

13. We fail to understand how the said submission can assist the officers of respondent – CIDCO or for that matter, the officers of the respondent – State authorities, from avoiding compliance of the positive direction issued by this Court. In this backdrop, this Court

was contemplating proceeding further against the officers of the State as well as CIDCO in contempt jurisdiction, when a short pass-over was sought to take instructions in the matter.

14. The petition was called out after 20 minutes when the learned senior counsel appearing for the officers of the respondent – CIDCO made a statement on instructions that the amount shall be deposited with the Deputy Collector, Land Acquisition positively within four weeks from today. The said statement made on behalf of respondent – CIDCO and its officers, is treated as an undertaking given to this Court.

15. The learned AGP appearing for the officers of the respondent – State authorities submitted that the amount so deposited by respondent – CIDCO, in terms of the aforesaid award, shall be disbursed to the petitioners immediately upon the same being received from the said respondent.

16. Upon deposit of compensation amount by the respondent – CIDCO, the respondent – State authorities are directed to disburse the same to the petitioners within one week of encashment of cheque or transfer of amount by any other instrument by the said respondent.

17. At this stage, it is correctly pointed out by the learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners that as per clause (g) of the said order quoted hereinabove, the Chief Secretary of the State of Maharashtra was required to conduct an enquiry and fix accountability and to report compliance within six months, as per paragraph No.34 of the said order. It appears that in the affidavits filed till date, the fate of enquiry has not been placed on record.

18. Hence, a responsible officer of the respondent – State shall place an affidavit on record within three weeks, giving details of the enquiry and action taken in pursuance thereof.

19. List the petition under the caption ‘for compliance’ on 18.09.2026, to be included in the supplementary list.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)

Priya Kambli