

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

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO.83 OF 2017

Santosh s/o.Uttamrao Rasve,
Age-25 years, Occu-Agri & Social Work,
R/o.Kharat-Adgaon, Tq.Majalgaon,
District: Beed.

PETITIONER

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra
& others

RESPONDENTS

...

Mr.M.B.Sandanshiv, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr.S.S.Dande, AGP for the respondent/State

...

**CORAM: S.S. SHINDE AND
S.M.GAVHANE, JJ.**

DATE : 18.01.2018

ORDER:

1] We have carefully perused the pleadings in the Petition. There are no material particulars, and the Petition suffers from details of the role played by the Talathis, against whom general and vague allegations are made. When the Petition is filed as Public Interest Litigation, the petitioner, before filing such Public Interest Litigation, has to do thorough research, and only after making such research by providing material

particulars and details, should undertake exercise of filing PIL.

2] The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *S.P.Anand, Indore Vs. H.D.Deve Gowda and ors.*¹ and in particular, paragraph 18 thereof, held that the petitioner should have a genuine source of information before filing the Public Interest Litigation and he must be well conversant with the facts pleaded in the petition.

3] As already observed, the pleadings in the PIL are too vague and general in nature. In our opinion, filing of such PIL is abuse of process of Court. In that view of the matter, the Public Interest Litigation stands dismissed.

4] If the amount has been deposited by the petitioner, the Registry shall return the said amount to the petitioner.

[S.M.GAVHANE]
JUDGE

[S.S.SHINDE]
JUDGE

DDC

¹ [1996] 6 SCC 734