

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA***WRIT PETITION NO.934 OF 2017***

Kanir Construction Pvt Ltd.

.....

Petitioner.

Versus

The Collector & District Magistrate,
South Goa and & Anr.

.....

Respondents.

Mr. Sudin Usgaonkar, Senior Advocate with Mr. K. Padgaonkar,
Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Sagar Dhargalkar, Additional Govt. Advocate for the
respondents.

***Coram : N.M. Jamdar &
Nutan D. Sardesai, JJ.***

Date : 1 November 2017.

P.C.:

Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.

2. The principal grievance raised by the Petitioner is that its application for licence to run cinema halls has not been responded to by the Respondent Authority and no reason is given as to why the licence cannot be granted. It is submitted on behalf of the Petitioner that all the compliances are in place, yet the Authorities are not taking any decision.

3. We are not inclined to go into the merits of the claim of the Petitioner, but, if the Petitioner has applied for grant of licence/permissions, etc., the Authorities must decide such application by giving reasons within a reasonable time and cannot defer the decision itself indefinitely.

4. The learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner states that grievance of the Petitioner and necessary details are contained in the Writ Petition. We direct the Collector & District Magistrate, South Goa, Margao to decide the representation of the Petitioner which is contained in the Writ Petition, within 15 days from today. If necessary, the Collector may call for additional documents from the Petitioner within one week from today. The learned Additional Govt. Advocate states that the copy of the Petition which is served on the Government Advocate would be furnished to the Collector to enable him to take decision. The Collector will give reasons in support of his decision. All contentions of the parties are kept open.

Nutan D. Sardesai, J.

N.M. Jamdar, J.