

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 10006 OF 2013

|                          |   |             |
|--------------------------|---|-------------|
| Atul Vinod Tambvekar     | } | Petitioner  |
| versus                   |   |             |
| The State of Maharashtra | } |             |
| and Ors.                 | } | Respondents |

Mr. Prathamesh A. Gokhale with  
Mr. Sameer P. Khedekar for the petitioner.

Mr. Madhav Jamdar for respondent no. 3.

CORAM :- S. C. DHARMADHIKARI &  
G. S. KULKARNI, JJ.

DATED :- MARCH 30, 2016

P.C. :-

1) By this petition, the petitioner complains that despite complaints of harassment and ragging at the campus, no action has been taken under the guidelines and rules so also regulations framed by the academic bodies. The complaints that the petitioner has made are indeed serious, as he was unable to concentrate on studies and was harassed continuously by some of his colleagues.

2) From a perusal of the petition, we find that the petitioner's grievance was considered by a committee of five persons including a lady academician and that fact finding committee set up as a Students Grievances Redressal Committee

of University of Mumbai submitted a report on 13<sup>th</sup> September, 2011. From a perusal of that report, we are of the view that the petitioner's complaint was thoroughly investigated. All the concerned persons were called and their statements were recorded. Upon a thorough consideration thereof, the committee opined in its detailed report that it is the petitioner who was responsible for harassing a girl student and that is how the petitioner filed a cross complaint in order to further harass the girl student.

3) In the teeth of such recommendations and findings of the committee, we do not find that the petitioner's grievance, as raised in the petition, deserves consideration in our equitable and discretionary writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The petitioner cannot seek the relief of quashing of the report. In these circumstances and if the petitioner still has any subsisting grievance including complaint of a criminal offence being committed, he is free to adopt such proceedings as are permissible in law.

4) With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition is dismissed.

**(G.S.KULKARNI, J.)**

**(S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)**