

SSK

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 2587 OF 2015**

Narsinh Kala Krida Va Sanskrutik MandalPetitioner
versus
State of MaharashtraRespondent

Mr. Manoj A. Patil, advocate for the petitioner.
Mrs. P. H. Kantharia, APP for the State.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.**

DATED : 20th JULY, 2015.

P.C.:

1. The petitioner claims to be a Mandal registered under Societies Registration Act, 1860. The petitioner is engaged in social activities such as kabaddi, exercise, kusthi, weight lifting, cricket,, volleyball, tennis, badminton, carom, chess, basket ball, rummy, hockey, judo, karate, table tennis, cycling, body building, kho kho, athletics and such other sitting games and other sports etc. The petitioner states that due to continuous harassment by the local police, it has become imperative for the petitioner to ask for relief as claimed in the petition. The relief claimed in the petition is to direct respondent not to enter the premises of the petitioner-Mandal without following due process of law and/or without any prior intimation/notice in the interests of justice.

2. Mrs. Kantharia learned APP submitted that no such blanket relief can be granted.

3. In our opinion, the relief claimed in prayer clause (a) has been articulated in such a manner that the effect of granting it, would be granting blanket relief to the petitioner. In our opinion, if the local police has reason to believe that some illegal activities are being conducted in the premises of the petitioner-Mandal, to unravel that or to immediately stop those activities, they are competent to enter the premises without giving notice to the petitioner. That action would nevertheless be with due procedure of law. In other words, we would only observe that the local police are free to enter the premises of the petitioner by following due process of law and may do so without giving prior notice/intimation in the given situation where they are authorised to do so by law.

4. We make it clear that none of the observations made in this order are expression of opinion either way on the assertion made by the petitioner that they are conducting activities which are only legitimate and permissible activities. We are not entering upon that discussion as it is not necessary to do so for the disposal of this petition.

5. In the light of the above order, the petition is disposed of.

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)