

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO.888 OF 2018

Ranbir Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Goa & Ors.

.... Respondents

Mr. A. D. Bhobe, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. P. Faldessai, Additional Government Advocate for Respondents.

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

Date : 10 September 2018.

P.C.:

Heard Mr. A. D. Bhobe, the learned counsel for the Petitioner and Mr. P. Faldessai, the learned Additional Government Advocate for the Respondents.

2. We do not deem it necessary to delve deeper into the controversy as the Petitioner's reliance on a letter dated 2 April 2018 issued by the Airports Authority of India appears to conclude the issue. By this letter, in respect of the scope of work regarding the

licence issued to the Petitioner, the Airports Authority of India issued the following communication to the Respondent No.2.

“We are in receipt of one letter dated 2 April 2018 from M/s Taj India Tours requesting therein to mention the scope of work in respect of Award of Licence vide our letter dated 3 October 2017.

In this regard, it is hereby intimated that the subject licence has been awarded by AAI, Goa to M/s Taj India Tours for providing Car rental/Maxi Cab service at Goa Airport after finalisation of tender process. There is no restriction/bar towards type and nature of cars/taxis to be plied by the licensee. The intent of the tender/award of licence towards scope of work is to operate/ply all type of vehicles as per the requirement of passengers by charging rates according to type of vehicles. This is also in line with the subject services being provided by different agencies at various AAI run airports across the country.”

3. Upon a query to the learned Additional Government Advocate whether the Respondent No.2 is bound by the clarification/direction of the Airports Authority of India, we are informed that the Respondent No.2 is so bound. That being the position, the Respondent-Authority will have to give effect to the communication dated 2 April 2018, if it is not modified or recalled. Since the communication is issued in April 2018, the effect be given to the communication within a period of two weeks from today.

4. As regards the prayer regarding law and order is concerned, that is the responsibility of the Respondent No.4- Officer Incharge of the Police Station. Needless to state that it is primary duty of the police to ensure that there is no law and order situation. No separate order is necessary.

5. The writ petition is disposed of in the above terms.

Prithviraj K. Chavan, J.

N.M. Jamdar, J.