

Vat

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY***ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION******PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION No. 89 OF 2014******Dinar Yashwant Sohoni******....Petitioner******Vs.******The State of Maharashtra and Ors.******....Respondents***

None appears on behalf of the Petitioner

Mr. Milind More -AGP for Respondent No.1 -State

Ms. Trupti Puranik for Respondent No.2 -BMC.

***CORAM : V. M. KANADE &
SMT. SWAPNA S. JOSHI, JJ******DATE : SEPTEMBER 21, 2016******P.C. :***

1. None appears on behalf of the Petitioner. Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent No.1 -State and Respondent No.2 – BMC.
2. The grievance of the Petitioner is that the Corporation has not taken any steps to ensure that the Fire Fighting Equipments have been installed in the shops, hotels and other establishments. It is the case of the Petitioner that the shops and establishment owners have not complied with section 42 and 52 of the Maharashtra Shops and

Establishment Act, 1961.

3. An affidavit in reply has filed on behalf of the Corporation. It has stated in the said reply that Assistant Divisional Fire Officers of the respective wards have visited the hotels and restaurants, listed by the Petitioner in this petition and it was seen by the said officers that the fire fighting equipments are in working condition. Detailed report of the same is annexed at Exhibit '1' to the said affidavit.

4. We have perused the report. We are satisfied that the adequate steps have been taken by the Corporation. In view of the reply filed by the Corporation, nothing survives in this PIL. Hence, PIL is disposed of.

SWAPNA S. JOSHI, J.

V.M. KANADE, J.