

pdp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
REVIEW PETITION NO. 86 OF 2016
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 7904 OF 2014

Shri M. Murali Krishna

.. Petitioner

Versus

Gokhale Institute for Politics and
Economics and ors.

.. Respondents

Mr. R. G. Panchal for petitioner.

Mr. K. S. Bapat i/by A. H. Fatangare for respondent nos.1 and 5.

Mr. Rajiv Chavan, Sr. Counsel a/w Ms. Nisha Valani for respondent no.3-
UOI.

Mr. P. G. Kathane, AGP for State.

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

SEPTEMBER 29, 2016.

P.C.

1. Mr. Panchal, learned counsel appearing for the review petitioner submits that respondent no. 5 – Dr. Rajas Parchure interferes in the day to day administration of the Gokhale Institute for Politics and Economics. The honest employees are troubled due to the interference of respondent no.5. Therefore, suitable directions are required to be issued to the management and respondent concerned. Learned counsel submitted

that the reports in respect of mismanagement of the Trust have also appeared in certain media reports. Reference has been made to the Apex Court judgment in the case of Dr. Ram Lakhan Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh through Chief Secretary **[2015 (12) SCALE 479]**.

2. Learned counsel appearing for respondent nos.1 and 5 submits that the review petitioner is in the habit of filing number of petitions / review petitions and levelling baseless charges against the management and the respondent no.5. The appropriate forums, in which proceedings are filed, will deal with the issue. There is no error apparent on the face of record. Therefore, the review petition is not maintainable.

3. We have perused the grounds of review and considered the submissions advanced before us. The grounds of review do not commend to us. There is no error apparent on the face of record. The review petition is sans merit. It is rejected.

(A. A. SAYED, J.)

(NARESH H. PATIL, J.)