

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 114/2016

Pankaj S/o Leeladhar @ Lalitji Meshram

..VS..

Joint Secretary & ors.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri S.R. Narnaware, Advocate for the petitioner
Shri S.A. Chaudhari, Advocate for the respondent no. 1
Shri D.P. Thakare, AGP for the respondent nos. 3 and 4

CORAM : B.P. DHARMADHIKARI AND
Z.A.HAQ, JJ.

DATED : 06/06/2018

1] Advocate Shri Narnaware has produced before us the communication dated 15/03/2018 issued by the Director, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment (respondent no. 5) which advises the Central Government, State Government and its functionaries to refrain from using the nomenclature "Dalit" while referring to members belonging to Scheduled Caste.

2] Advocate Shri Narnaware submits that because of this communication, grievance made in prayer (a) is redressed.

3] Learned AGP pointed out that because of this decision, State Government is also deliberating and appropriate decision on line could be taken at the earliest. Advocate Shri Narnaware submits that as State Government is taking a decision, the direction to State Government at this juncture is also not necessary.

4] Advocate Shri Narnaware however adds that the media needs to be asked to refrain from using said word. He points out that Press Council of India and Ministry of Information and Broadcasting are party respondents before this Court.

5] Advocate Shri Choudhari appearing for respondent no. 1 submits that he has received copy of letter dated 15/03/2018 today only in Court from the petitioner and he needs time to obtain instructions about it.

6] As Central Government has issued necessary directions to its officers, we find that it can also issue suitable directions as per law to the respondent no. 2 and the media to refrain from using same word. Various institutes in the field are not before us and hence, we direct respondent no. 1 to consider the question of issuing such direction to the media and take suitable decision upon it within next six weeks.

7] Similarly we direct respondent no. 3 to take appropriate decision within next eight weeks.

8] In view of this development, Advocate Shri Narnaware submits that PIL may be disposed of as grievance is settled. Hence, without prejudice to the rights and contention of intervenor/respondent no. 6 who is absent today, we dispose of present PIL accordingly. No costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE