

Santosh

***IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA***  
***PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION W.P. NO. 27 OF 2016***  
***WITH***  
***MISC. CIVIL APPLICATION NO.221 OF 2017***

|                                                     |       |              |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| Jose Lobo & Anr.                                    | ..... | Petitioners. |
| Versus                                              |       |              |
| The Goa Coastal Aquaculture Authority<br>and others | ..... | Respondents. |

Ms. Norma Alvares, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. Mahesh Amonkar, Central Govt. Standing Counsel for the Respondents No.1 to 3.

Mr. Praveen Faldessai, Addl. Government Advocate for the Respondents No.4 and 6.

Ms. Neha Shirodkar, Advocate for the Respondent No.7.

Ms. A. Fernandes, Advocate for the Respondent No.8.

***Coram : N.M. Jamdar &***  
***Prithviraj K. Chavan, JJ.***

***Date : 11 October 2018.***

**P.C.:**

By this Petition, the Petitioners have sought for quashing the registrations of the aquaculture farm of Respondents No.7 and 8.

2. The Petition had come up on board on various occasions and orders have been passed on 13 November 2017, 18 April 2018,

13 June 2018, 10 July 2018, 27 August 2018, 24 September 2018, and 9 October 2018. Fact situation is noted in all these orders. Statements made by the Authorities and the documents have been placed on record. It is an admitted position at the Bar that as on date licences granted to Respondents No.7 and 8 have been cancelled by the Authorities. Therefore, as on date, it is not necessary to keep the PIL Petition pending, as the relief sought for by the Petitioners for cancellation of the licences has been granted.

3. The learned Counsel for the Petitioners states that in case any licences are sought to be granted to these respondents, the said fact be intimated to the Petitioners to enable the Petitioners to take necessary steps, as the Petition is not being argued on merits. The learned Additional Govt. Advocate appearing for the State states that the decision will have to be taken by the Coastal Aquaculture Authority, Government of India and when such a decision is taken, it will be intimated to the State and the Petitioners will be informed of the same.

4. If the licence of the Respondent No.8 is sought to be renewed by the Authorities, then the fact would be intimated to the Petitioners. In case, Respondent No.7 intends to challenge the order of cancellation of the licence, the Respondent No.7 will make the Petitioners party in those proceedings, since we have not considered

the merits of the Petition.

4. With these observations, the PIL Petition is disposed of.

5. Misc. Civil Application stands disposed of.

*Prithviraj K. Chavan, J.*

*N.M. Jamdar, J.*