

pdp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 59 OF 2015

Shri Santosh Abhimanya Bhosale & anr.

.. Petitioners

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra and ors.

.. Respondents

Mr. M. A. Patil for petitioners.

Mr. P. P. Kakade, AGP for respondent nos.1, 2, 4 and 5.

Mr. A. Y. Sakhare, Sr. Counsel i/by Mr. P. D. Paranape for respondent no.6.

Mrs. Neha Bhide for respondent no.7.

CORAM: NARESH H. PATIL &
A. A. SAYED, JJ.

FEBRUARY 17, 2016.

P.C.

1. The petitioners' grievance is that the subject bridge constructed was Taluka Level Bridge. More than necessary fund was spent on the subject bridge by the State. The petitioners, therefore, pray that inquiry be instituted. The petitioners object to the design of the bridge, which, in view of the petitioners, is not safe for the public.

2. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent no.6 submits that the road is already constructed and bridge is completed. The learned Senior Counsel submits that the Rules annexed at page 40 i.e.

Geometric Design Standards for Rural (Non-Urban) Highways are not applicable to the subject matter of this PIL.

3. At this stage we are not inclined to interfere in the matter. However, petitioners may file comprehensive representation to the concerned authority in respect of subject matter of this PIL. We do not express any opinion,

4. The PIL is accordingly disposed of.

(A. A. SAYED, J.)

(NARESH H. PATIL,J.)