

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO. 2592 OF 2016

Consumer Courts Advocates Association, Through its President

-vs-

State of Mah., thr.its Secretary, Deptt.of Food, Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs & others

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders.

None for the petitioner.
Mrs.Bharti Dangre, GP for the respondents.

CORAM : SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK &
MRS. SWAPNA JOSHI, JJ.

DATE : 14.07.2016.

By this petition, the petitioner-Consumer Courts Advocates Association seeks a direction to the respondents to immediately allot the land behind Suyog Building to the respondent No.2-State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission so that the same could be utilized for housing the Circuit Bench of the National Commission, bar room, library, rest room, etc.

It is the case of the petitioner that a request was made by the petitioner to the different authorities of the State Government to allot the land behind Suyog Building to the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission. It is the case of the petitioner that the land behind Suyog Building is only utilized as a Dining Hall and kitchen for the Press Reporters for a maximum period of two weeks during the Assembly Session in Nagpur. It is stated that the open land and the structure of Suyog Building is simply used by the respondent No.4-Executive Engineer, Public Works Department as a godown. It is stated that the said land should be allotted to the respondent No.2, so that the same could be utilized for the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission for housing the Circuit Bench of the National Commission, bar room, library, rest room, etc.

Mrs. Bharti Dangre, the learned Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents, states on instructions that the land behind Suyog Building cannot be allotted to the respondent No.2. It is stated that the Authorities have taken a decision not to allot the said land to the respondent No.2. It is stated that if the petitioner makes a request for allotment of some other land, the same would be considered, in accordance with law.

In the circumstances of the case, we are not inclined to grant the relief as sought by the petitioner. The petitioner cannot seek the allotment of a specific land i.e. the land behind Suyog Building for the respondent No.2. The petitioner could have filed a writ petition seeking a direction against the State Government to allot the land at an appropriate place for its utilization as a Circuit Bench of the National Commission, bar room, library rest room, etc. A demand cannot be made by an Association for a particular or specific piece of land only. The only relief sought by the petitioner in the instant petition is for a direction to the respondents to grant the land behind Suyog Building to the respondent No.2. When the respondent-Authorities have taken a decision not to allot the land behind Suyog Building to the respondent No.2, a direction cannot be issued against the respondent-State Government to allot that specific land to the respondent No.2.

In view of the aforesaid, we dispose of the writ petition with no order as to costs.

The petitioner is, however, free to take appropriate steps for seeking some other land for the purpose of the Circuit Bench of the National Commission and / or for the other requirements of the members of the Bar Association. Order accordingly.

JUDGE

JUDGE