
(2017) 04 BOM CK 0029

In the Bombay High Court

Case No : SUO MOTU Contempt Petition No.1 of 2017

High Court on its own Motion

APPELLANT

Vs

Ketan Tirodkar

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 11-04-2017

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2017) 3 RCRCivil 288

Hon'ble Judges : Dr. Manjula Chellur, CJ., Shantanu S. Kemkar, A.S. Oka, S.C. Dharmadhikari and R.M. Savant, JJ.

Bench : Full Bench

Advocate : J.P. Yagnik, APP, for the State; None present, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Disposed Off

Judgement

1. Mr.J.P. Yagnik, learned APP is present. Respondent absent.
2. Registry has placed note that notice was tried to be served on the respondent. However, he was not available at the address. Subsequently, on 27th March 2017, one Advocate Sandesh Sawant appeared before the concerned police and informed that the respondent is aware of the proceedings and he is out of station. The notice has returned unserved.
3. Today, when the matter is called out, Smt.Vichare from the Criminal Application Branch is before us and she placed on record the reply affidavit of the respondent which is notarized and it is dated 27th March 2017. The presentation form shows that party in person was present. However, signature of person appearing on affidavit shows name of one S.S. Sawant, in all probability, Mr.Sandesh Sawant along with his mobile number. Since the proceedings being Contempt proceedings, we direct the Commissioner of Police, Mumbai to see that notice is served on the respondent in person so as to secure his presence before the Court. Mr.Sandesh Sawant whose mobile number is furnished to the office is also directed to remain present in the Court on the next date of hearing.
4. In the meanwhile, we direct the learned Prosecutor who is present before the

Court to see that directions at paragraph no.6 of the order dated 22nd February 2017 are strictly complied with.

5. Stand over to 16th June 2017 at 4.30 p.m.