

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 503 OF 2017

IN

MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 224 OF 2017

GOA COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT
AUTHORITY.,

... Applicant

Versus

THE GOA FOUNDATION THR. ITS
SECRETARY, DR CLAUDE ALVARES.,

... Respondent

Shri Dattaprasad Lawande, Advocate General with Ms. P.
Bhandari, Additional Government Advocate for the applicant /
original respondent no.3.

Ms. Norma Alvares, learned Advocate for the respondents /
original petitioners.

Shri D. J. Pangam, learned Advocate for the original
respondents.

Coram:- F. M. REIS &
NUTAN D. SARDESSAI, JJ.

Date:- 3rd July, 2017

P.C.:

Heard Shri Dattaprasad Lawande, learned Advocate General
for the applicant / original respondent no.3, Ms. Norma Alvares,
learned Advocate for respondents / original petitioners and Shri
D. J. Pangam, learned Advocate for the original respondents.

2. This is an application for extension of time for the
compliance of the directions issued by this Court while disposing
of Writ Petition No.333 of 1993 by Judgment dated 29/06/2015.
Ms Norma Alvares, learned Counsel appearing for the

respondents/ original petitioners strongly opposes the said extension of time inter alia on the ground that while disposing of an application for extension of time by order dated 03/04/2017, it was clearly mentioned that time was extended by six weeks as last chance. It is further pointed out that though during the said period the joint inspection was carried out wherein the representative of the petitioner was also present, the matter was deferred as the DSLR was present without the requisite instruments. It is further pointed out that the original respondent/ applicant herein have disobeyed the directions of this Court and as such no further extension deserves to be granted in the above application.

3. Learned Advocate General submits that though the applicants desired to comply with the directions of this Court, nevertheless according to him as the Member Secretary of GCZMA was on election duty such exercise was delayed. He further pointed out that all measures will be taken to ensure that the directions would be complied with on or before 16/07/2017. It is further submitted that the delay was not intentional and as such time be extended accordingly.

4. We have considered the rival contentions and also gone through the records of the original Judgment which was passed somewhere in 2015. We are not satisfied with the reasons given

from time to time for extension of time. But however considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case we grant a final extension to comply with the directions issued in the said Judgment dated 29/06/2015 while disposing off the above Writ Petition upto 12/07/2017.

5. Needless to say, the Chief Secretary and Secretary of the Concerned Department to ensure that such directions are complied with within the time granted, after giving a notice of inspection to the petitioner / concerned parties in terms of the earlier order. Copy of the report be furnished to the petitioner within one week thereafter and file the same in this Court.

6. Parties to act on the authenticated copy.

NUTAN D. SARDESSAI, J.

F. M. REIS, J.

mv