

Shephali

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 1690 OF 2015**

Island Aviation Services Limited	...Petitioner
<i>Versus</i>	
Government of India through its secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs & Ors.	...Respondents

Ms. Prachi Manekar, *for the Petitioner.*
Mr. Parag Vyas, *for the Respondents Nos. 1 to 5.*

**CORAM: S.C. DHARMADHIKARI &
G.S. PATEL, JJ.**
DATED: 11th January 2016

P.C.:

1. Since the hearing was already concluded on the earlier occasion, and the matter was posted today for passing orders, we had expressly reserved liberty to the Advocate for the Petitioners to tender a compilation of judgments which she proposed to rely upon on the earlier date. We had directed that the same be circulated in advance. We do not find any such compilation being circulated despite sufficient and adequate time having been granted. The matter was posted today for orders and the learned Advocate for the Petitioners submitted that there are further arguments that she wants to make on the facts. We do not countenance any such

request for the simple reason that Petitions ought to contain all the material and relevant statements on facts and the annexures thereto should be the copies of the same. For incorporating any factual averments, there was adequate time available to the Petitioners and their Advocate since the Petition is filed in this Court way back on 15th July 2015. Prior thereto it was filed but rejected by the Registry on 3rd March 2015. Later on it was restored to file and from July 2015 till date, we do not find any attempt being made to incorporate further factual statements. This is a second round of litigation and the Affidavit in Reply of the Respondents is already on our file. The belated request cannot be accepted. The Petitioners' Advocate has canvassed some legal submissions which we have duly noted and shall deal with the same.

2. For the reasons separately recorded, the Writ Petition is rejected. Though it is a second round and considerable judicial time has been taken, which is precious, we refrain from imposing costs and feel that this is sufficient reminder to such litigants for future.

(G. S. PATEL, J.)

(S. C. DHARMADHIKARI, J.)