

Urmila Ingale

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 34 OF 2017

Madhukar Muralidhar Nazare

.. Petitioner

Vs.

State of Maharashtra and anr.

.. Respondents

Mr.Virendra Ichalkaranjekar I/b Mr.Sanjiv Punalekar, for the
Petitioner.

Mr. Rajan Pawar, AGP for Respondents No. 1 & 2 - State.

**CORAM : NARESH H. PATIL, CHIEF JUSTICE &
M.S.KARNIK, J.**

DATE : 21st NOVEMBER, 2018

P.C. :

. The Petitioner submits that there is mismanagement in the temples/trusts governed by the Pashchim Maharashtra Devasthan Samiti which runs several temples/trusts including Mahalaxmi temple and Jyotiba temple. Learned Counsel submits that the present Petitioner has filed two more Petitions in respect of temples at Pandharpur and Tuljapur. This Court has passed certain directions in those Petitions.

2. The general grievance of the Petitioner according to the learned Counsel is that the law and judicial department of the State is not attentive enough to look into the allegations as and when brought to the notice of the office of Law Secretary/State Government in respect of mismanagement of the temples wherein the nominated committee boards are functioning. The Petitioner expects the Charity Commissioner of the State to be proactive and look into the said issues and formulate appropriate policy by issuing necessary directions in accordance with law. As administrative steps are not taken diligently, persons like the Petitioner who desire to raise issues in public interest have to rush to this Court.

3. We have perused the record placed before the Court. Considered the submissions advanced. The Petitioner has already filed two more Petitions which are pending in this Court. However, in case specific incidents are to be brought to the notice of the Charity Commissioner of the concerned region, the Petitioner is at liberty to file comprehensive representation in

respect of specific issue to the Charity Commissioner. In case the Petitioner files such representation before the Charity Commissioner, the Charity Commissioner after perusal of the same and after calling for necessary information is free to take appropriate steps.

4. The Public Interest Litigation is disposed of.

5. It is made clear that we have not expressed any opinion on the issues raised in the PIL.

(M.S.KARNIK, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)