

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

WRIT PETITION NO.700/2016

Lalan Kishor Singh s/o Suvarna Prasad Singh

...Versus...

State of Maharashtra, through its Secretary, Finance Department, Government
of Maharashtra, Mantralaya, Mumbai and another

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Petitioner-in-person
Shri P.S. Tembhare, AGP for respondents

CORAM : SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK AND
V.M. DESHPANDE, JJ.

DATE : 23.03.2016

By this petition, the petitioner seeks the initiation of an enquiry to probe into the matter in accordance with the order in Writ Petition No.868/2014 dated 20.12.2014.

It is the case of the petitioner, who appears in person, that he had placed the information received by him under the Right to Information Act in this Court in Writ Petition No.868/2014 and it was informed to this Court in Writ Petition No.868/2014 that the sales tax outstanding against the defaulters are in crores. It is stated that this Court had directed that the writ petition should be treated as a public interest litigation and the same should be placed before the appropriate Bench. It is stated that the public interest litigation was disposed of on 9.3.2015 by

directing the respondents to work out the exact amount payable, in accordance with the Government Resolution, dated 5.6.2007 and pay the same to the petitioner. It is stated that though in the public interest litigation it was necessary for the Court to look into the matter in regard to the complaint made by the petitioner against hundreds of defaulters of sales tax dues which ran into crores, that aspect of the matter was not looked into, by this Court in the public interest litigation. The petitioner has, therefore, filed the instant petition seeking an enquiry in the matter of the complaint against the defaulters of sales tax dues.

It would not be proper to entertain this writ petition as the petitioner had filed Writ Petition No.868/2014 seeking similar relief and the writ petition was treated as public interest litigation. The said public interest litigation is disposed of by the judgment, dated 9.3.2015. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the said judgment, the petitioner has other remedies. However, it would not be possible for this Court to entertain a second writ petition in regard to the same issue, that was raised in the first one.

Hence, we dispose of the writ petition with no order as to costs. The petitioner is, however, free to take appropriate steps.

JUDGE

JUDGE