

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 1222 OF 2016

Pravin Gorakh Patil

..Petitioner

Vs

Municipal Commissioner of
Greater Mumbai

..Respondent

Mr. Pravin Gorakh Patil – Petitioner-in-person present.
Ms Oorja Dhond for Respondent – BMC.

CORAM : SHANTANU S. KEMKAR &
M. S. SONAK, JJ.
DATE : JULY 18, 2017

P.C. :

Heard the petitioner who is present in person.

2] Upon our query as to the *locus standi* of the petitioner, he states that this petition has been instituted by him in public interest. Taking into consideration the issues raised and the nature of relief claimed, it does appear that the petitioner is purporting to espouse interest of several employees. The petitioner also states that he has personal interest in the matter since his own grievances, in relation to his service have not been redressed.

3] The Hon'ble Supreme Court has repeatedly held that ordinarily in service matters, no public interest litigations may be entertained. In this regard, reference can usefully be made to the following

decisions:

- (1) ***Madan Lal vs. High Court of Jammu and Kashmir & Ors.***¹;
- (2) ***Girjesh Shrivastava & Ors. vs. State of Madhya Pradesh & Ors.***²;
- (3) ***Duryodhan Sahu (Dr.) vs. Jitendra Kumar Mishra***³;
- (4) ***Ashok Kumar Pandey vs. State of W.B.***⁴; and
- (5) ***Hari Bansh Lal vs. Sahodar Prasad Mahto***⁵

4] For the aforesaid reasons, we do not deem it appropriate to entertain the present petition. The present petition is therefore dismissed. However, we grant the petitioner liberty to take out appropriate proceedings for redressal of his personal grievances, if any.

5] With liberty as aforesaid, the present petition is dismissed. There shall however be no order as to costs.

(M. S. SONAK, J.)

(SHANTANU S. KEMKAR, J.)

Chandka

1 (2014) 15 SCC 308

2 (2010) 10 SCC 707

3 (1998) 7 SCC 273

4 (2004) 3 SCC 349

5 (2010) 9 SCC 655