

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.1430 OF 2016

**PUNJABI CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD)
AND ORS.)...PETITIONERS**

V/s.

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.)...RESPONDENTS

None for the Petitioners.

Mr.Kapil Mage, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.

Ms.Kavita Salunke, AGP for the Respondent – State.

Mr.Abhishek Khare i/b. Khare Legal Chambers, Advocate for
Respondent Nos.4 and 5.

Mr.Ashish Kamath a/w. Mr.Rahul Mehta & Mr.Himanshu
Chowdhary i/b. Naik Naik & Co., Advocate for Respondent No.6.

**CORAM : A. S. OKA, J. &
A. M. BADAR, J.**

DATE : 23rd NOVEMBER 2016.

P.C. :

1 None appears for the petitioners. Heard the learned
counsel appearing for the respondents. The challenge in this
petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is to the
certification of the movie Santa Banta Private Limited issued by

the second respondent (Central Board of Film Certification). The certification was issued on 26th October 2015. On 29th March 2016, a Division Bench of the High Court of Delhi passed an order on a writ petition filed by Delhi Sikh Gurdwara Management Committee and another for virtually the same relief which is sought in this petition. While disposing of the writ petition by order dated 29th March 2016, the Delhi High Court directed the second respondent to treat the petition as a representation and to consider whether U/A certificate issued to the film in question requires re-consideration.

2 There is an affidavit in reply filed by Smt. Sheetal Tandel on behalf of second respondent. The said affidavit deals with the compliance made with the decision of the Delhi High Court. Paragraphs 14 to 17 record compliance made by the second respondent with the directions issued by the Delhi High Court. Paragraph 19 records that the producer of the movie voluntarily agreed to make certain changes which are set out in the said paragraph. The said changes were suggested by the members of the second respondent. The order dated 7th April 2016 was made by the second respondent directing that the aforesaid changes be made including the addition of a disclaimer. The affidavit of the fourth and fifth respondents records that the film has been already released on 22nd April 2016.

3 Hence, there is no reason to interfere at this stage in writ jurisdiction under the Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Petition is rejected.

(A. M. BADAR, J.)

(A. S. OKA, J.)