

**106 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Civil Writ Petition No. 16370 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision : November 04, 2016

Rohit Goyal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.S. SARON
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL**

Present: Mr. Harmandeep Singh Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

S.S. SARON, J.

The petition has been filed for issuing appropriate orders or directions against the respondents alleging that they have wilfully disobeyed the orders and directions passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India; besides the State has failed to implement the process of affixing High Security Registration Plates ('HSRP' - for short) on motor vehicles and implement the scheme for affixing HSRP for more than 18 months and thereby jeopardising the safety and security of the public at large.

According to the petitioner, the respondent-State has failed to implement the HSRP scheme and has also failed to initiate civil and criminal proceedings against the private respondents No. 3 to 6. The petitioner alleges that the private respondents No. 3 to 6 had committed acts of cheating and fraud against more than 13 lakh vehicle owners in the State over a period of three years. Therefore, it is prayed that the grievance of public at large be redressed by

providing them with HSRP so that the provisions of Rule 50 of the Central Motor Vehicle Rules, 1989 and orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India are complied with.

The petitioner, in support of his PIL, has filed his affidavit in which he states that he was a practising lawyer and responsible citizen of India. During the course of hearing learned counsel for the petitioner has, however, submitted that the petitioner is not a practising lawyer and this has been written inadvertently. It is stated that the petitioner in fact is a businessman.

A Division Bench of this Court in **Ajaib Singh versus State of Punjab 2013 (4) PLR 367** while interpreting Rule 7 of the Maintainability of Public Interest Litigation Rules, 2010 ('Rules' - for short), inter alia, held that a petitioner invoking the PIL jurisdiction of the Court has to specifically disclose his credentials and his direct or indirect personal motive or interest involved in the case, if any, by way of an affidavit. The expression "specifically disclose his credentials" it was held, must, naturally, imply that he has to set forth what he does for his living, what public interest he has been espousing, the work done by him in that behalf, the particulars of any matter preferred by him as PIL earlier on which the Court has passed orders, etc. It cannot imply merely writing a sentence that a person is residing in the State, is public-spirited and is, thus, filing a PIL.

The petitioner to say the least has not complied with any of the circumstances as laid down by the Division Bench of this Court in **Ajaib Singh's** case (supra). The petitioner has merely mentioned that he is actively engaged in the issue relating to crime control,

traffic control, violation of Traffic Rules; besides safety and security of public at large. In furtherance to this objective, it is submitted that he has put various hoardings in agreement with Traffic police of Ludhiana and also in few other districts within the State especially to educate people and the traffic police personnel about the crime control, Traffic rules, traffic control etc., as most of the crimes like kidnapping, murder, loot, drug trafficking, terrorist attacks in the State and country are being perpetrated with the abuse of motor vehicles.

The nature of hoardings that have been put or the steps taken in crime control, traffic control etc. are not supported by any material. Besides, litigation is going between the State of Punjab and M/s Agros Impex (I) Private Limited (respondent No. 4) regarding the order passed by the Arbitration Tribunal. The said litigation relates to providing of HSRP. The petitioner having failed to show any locus standi to file the petition, is not to be allowed to lightly litigate by way of a PIL.

In the circumstances, the petitioner has no locus standi to file the writ petition and the petition filed by him is dismissed.

(S.S. Saron)
Judge

(Lisa Gill)
Judge

November 04, 2016
rts

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No