

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 3260 OF 2010

RAVINDRA VENKATRAO PATHAK
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ORS

...

None for the Petitioner.
AGP for Respondent 1/ State : Shri Y.G.Gujrathi.
Advocate for Respondent 2 : Shri S.M.Godsay.

...

**CORAM: RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
AND
SUNIL K. KOTWAL, JJ.**

DATE :- 17th November, 2017

Per Court :

1 On 06.11.2017 as none appeared for the Petitioner, we had passed the following order:-

- "1. *None for the Petitioner.*
2. *This petition was earlier dismissed in default and subsequently, restored.*
3. *Stand over to 17.11.2017, for passing orders on dismissal."*

2 Even today, none appears for the Petitioner though the matter is shown on the Board for passing orders on dismissal.

3 Despite the absence of the Petitioner, we have considered the voluminous petition paper book with the assistance of the learned AGP appearing on behalf of the Respondents/ State and Shri Godsay, learned

Advocate appearing on behalf of Respondent No.2.

4 The prayer put forth by the Petitioner in clause 24-B reads as under:-

"(B) *By issuing writ of mandamus or any other writ in like nature, the respondent No.1 Government may be directed to implement the scheme introduced by the petitioner and which is accepted by them.*"

5 On the one hand, the said prayer appears to be in the nature of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) and on the other hand, this petition has not been registered as a PIL.

6 Even otherwise, in this petition, a direction that the Government should implement its public policies, is sought. We are not inclined to consider the same since the learned AGP informs that after a passage of about seven to eight years, different policies for electricity conservation are being considered by the State and it is for the State to implement such policies.

7 Considering the above, we do not find any merit in this Writ Petition and the same is, therefore, dismissed.