

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 147 OF 2014

Nainesh Suresh Dolas ... Petitioner.

V/s.

The Chairman of AICTE,  
All India Council for Technical Education & ors. ... Respondents.

Mahendra M. Agavekar for the petitioner.

M.A.Choudhari for respondent No.10.

**CORAM : NARESH H. PATIL AND  
A.S. GADKARI, JJ.**

**DATED : 14<sup>th</sup> January 2015.**

**PC.**

The petitioner claims to be a social worker. The grievance of the petitioner is that respondent college is not functioning properly; there are certain deficiencies against which he raised certain proceedings before the revenue authorities and the Court. In this petition, the petitioner prays for following directions:

- a) Direction to respondent Nos.1 to 5 to take decision regarding the illegalities and deficiencies of the college as described in the representations made by the petitioner within a period of one month.
- b) Direction to respondent Nos.6 to 9 to take decision regarding the illegalities and deficiencies of the college as described in the representations made by the petitioner within a period of one month.

2. The learned counsel appearing for respondent No.10 submits that the petitioner has no locus to raise the issue which are raised in this petition. He is in habit of filing petitions. The matter has gone up to the Apex Court. Learned counsel places reliance on the copy of order dated 6<sup>th</sup> December 2013 passed by the Supreme Court in SLP No.19615/2013; order dated 24<sup>th</sup> March 2014 passed by Division Bench of this Court in PIL No.67/2013.

3. We have perused the aforesaid orders. Prima facie, we are not convinced to entertain this petition as the issue raised has already been addressed in the earlier proceedings. The statutory body of AICTE or Charity Commissioner are empowered to look into such issues. Petition is dismissed.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.10 submits that it is a fifth time petition is dismissed. The petitioner is in habit of filing petition and proceedings against the institution without making respondent No.10 aware of the same or without making it party. He, therefore, prays for heavy costs. The issue of imposition of costs would be considered in case the petitioner again resorts to filing of similar petition in future.

**(A.S. GADKARI, J.)**

Sanjay Nanoskar, ES..

**(NARESH H. PATIL, J.)**