

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

Civil Application (O) No. 932 of 2015 in PIL no. 36 of 2011

Priyadarshan Chandrashekhar Madhkholkar and another vs. The State of
Maharashtra.

Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders.	<u>Court's or Judge's</u> <u>Orders.</u>
---	---

Shri A.S.Bhandarkar, Adv. For petitioners.
Shri N.S.Rao, AGP for R-1.
Shri A.D.Mohogaonkar, Adv. For R-2 & 5.
Shri S.V.Purohit, adv. For R-4.
Shri N.A.Padhye Adv. For R-6
Shri Rohit Deo, Adv. For R-7
Shri Sanyal, Adv. For R-8

CORAM: B.R.GAVAI & INDIRA K. JAIN, JJ
DATE : 24.6.2015

Civil Application No. 932 of 2015 has been filed for
the disposal of the petition.

2. The present Public Interest Litigation is filed by a public spirited citizen, who also happens to be an eminent practicing lawyer before this court for a direction that the closure of 4 Units (105 MW) of respondent no.5 Koradi

Thermal Power Station, Koaradi is illegal and for a further direction to restart the said 4 Units immediately.

3. We have heard Shri Bhandarkar, learned counsel for the petitioners. The learned counsel submits that the main objection of the petitioners is that the units have been closed with an ulterior motive without there being any arrangements for the new units. He submits that the closure would have effect of reducing electricity supply and thereby causing hardships to the citizens of Nagpur. In the said application, it is categorically stated that Unit No. VIII has already been synchronized on 25th February, 2015 and the experimental generation has been found to be successful at the preliminary stage which would start generating electricity regularly within a short span. Insofar as Unit No. IX is concerned, it is stated that the same is already erected and generated. It is stated that it has been lighted once successfully for the testing purpose. Insofar as unit No. X is concerned, the work of the said unit is in progress and the probable period to light up the same is by April, 2015.

4. In that view of the matter, the apprehension of the petitioners appears to be not subsisted. The respondent M.S.E.D. has given specific details regarding the three units,

the work of which is either completed or almost completed.

5. In that view of the matter, we dispose of the petition (PIL). Needless to state that the petitioners, if have any subsisting grievances insofar as not starting the units within the specified period or with regard to any other grievances, the petitioners would be always at liberty to approach this Court. The civil application is disposed of.

JUDGE

JUDGE

patle