

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 642 OF 2015

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 248 OF 2014

THE STATE OF GOA, THROUGH THE
CHIEF SECRETARY AND ANR.,

... Applicants

Versus

KEVAL SHRIHARI RAMANI.

... Respondent

Mr. Vivek Angelo Rodrigues, Government Advocate for the
applicants.

Mr. R. G. Ramani, Advocate for the respondent.

Coram:- F. M. REIS &
NUTAN D. SARDESSAI, JJ.

Date:- 18th April, 2016

P.C.

Heard Mr. V. Rodrigues, learned Government Advocate
appearing for the applicants and Mr. R. G. Ramani, learned counsel
appearing for the respondent.

2. This is an application for extension of time to comply with
the directions issued by this Court by judgment dated 08.05.2015
while disposing of Writ Petition No. 248 of 2014. It is pointed out by
Mr. V. Rodrigues, learned Government Advocate appearing for the
applicants that eight weeks time was granted by an order dated
17.06.2015 to comply with the directions in the said judgment. It is
further pointed out that within the said period of time intimation was

given to the respondent/original petitioner to subject himself for an interview before an Expert Committee which was due to meet on 2/3rd September, 2015. The learned Government Advocate further pointed out that the respondent/original petitioner had not subjected himself to such interview on the said two dates and as such the directions issued by this Court could not be complied with and consequently sought for extension of time of eight weeks to comply with such directions.

3. On the other hand, Mr. R. Ramani, learned counsel appearing for the respondent/original petitioner has vehemently opposed the said request. The learned counsel has pointed out that the applicants/original respondents have committed contempt of the orders of this Court as according to him the orders clearly disclose that the respondent/original petitioner had to be considered for the Goa Scholarship Scheme for the year 2013-14 but however, in terms of the said communication the applicants/original respondents were purporting to examine the respondent herein for the scholarship for the year 2015-16. The learned counsel further pointed out that this itself is a disobedience of the directions of this Court and consequently, according to him the respondent/original petitioner was forced to reply to the said communication of the applicants/original respondents to the effect that the question of subjecting himself for an interview before an Expert Committee constituted to examine the grant of scholarship for the year 2015-16 would be in breach of the

directions issued by this Court. The learned counsel further pointed out that the applicants/original respondents are not interested to comply with the directions of this Court and as such, according to him the application be rejected. The learned counsel has extensively taken us through the affidavit filed by the respondent/original petitioner to disclose the reason why the original petitioner has failed to subject himself to an interview.

4. We have considered the submissions of the learned counsel and we have also gone through the records. In the communication dated 12.08.2015, it was clearly mentioned that the original petitioner would be considered for the Goa Scholarship Scheme for the year 2013-14. Though the communication states that the respondent/original petitioner would be subjected to an interview by an Expert Committee constituted to examine the Goa Scholarship Scheme for the year 2015-16, the question of considering the respondent/original petitioner in the Goa Scholarship Scheme for the year 2015-16 would not arise at all. The directions issued by this Court are very clear and have attained finality and as such there is no reason to deviate from such directions. In such circumstances, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, we dispose of the above application by extending time to comply with the directions issued by this Court in the judgment dated 08.05.2015 by a period of six weeks from today as last chance. It is made clear that no further extension shall be granted on any count.

5. The application stands disposed of accordingly.

NUTAN D. SARDESSAI, J.

F. M. REIS, J.

at*