

Supreme Court of India

Bal Thackrey vs Harish Pimpalkhute & Anr. on 27 March, 1997

Equivalent citations: 1998 (3) SCALE 440 b

Bench: K Ramaswamy, G Pattanaik

ORDER

1. The Advocate General of State of Maharashtra was impleaded as a party-respondent in the contempt petitions in the High Court. He is also impleaded as respondent no. 8 in these appeals. But by our order dt. February 19, 1997, we directed that notice to respondent nos. 3-17 were not necessary. After going through the record, we found that the explanation of the Advocate General is as to why he had not considered the application filed by respondent nos. 1 & 2 who initiated the contempt proceedings is necessary. It is stated in the written submissions of respondent nos. 1 & 2 that the Advocate General had received the notice from respondent no. 1 on 26.11.1996 and the application was moved for contempt on 2.12.1996. The Advocate General has to explain why he had not taken decision on application filed from the date of the receipt till the date of the filing of the complaint? He appeared in the Court on 4.2.1997 but he did not give any explanation. Even by that date he had not taken any decision. He merely stated that if the time was given he would consider. We want an explanation from the Advocate General why he has not taken any decision. He should appear in Court on 14.4.97 and give the explanation in writing. Post on 14.4.97.

2. Registry is directed to call for the original record from the High Court.