

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED: 09.10.2018
CORAM:
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.MANIKUMAR
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

WP.No.26693 of 2018
and WMP No.31065 of 2018
G.Arumugam ... Petitioner

vs.

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Represented by its Secretary to Government,
Department of Revenue,
Fort Saint George, Chennai - 600 009.

2. The District Collector,
District Collectorate,
Coimbatore.

3. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Coimbatore South Division,
Coimbatore.

4. The Tahsildar,
Sulur Taluk,
Coimbatore District.

5. The Village Administrative Officer,
31-Varapatty Village,
Varapatty, Sulur-Taluk,
Coimbatore District. ... Respondents

WRIT Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to re classify S.F.Nos.1001, Varapatty Village, Sulur Taluk, Coimbatore District as Tank Poramboke and maintain the same as Tank Poramboke without any assignment to any individual.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.R.Thangavel

For Respondents : Mr.S.Kamalesh Kannan
Government Advocate

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by S.MANIKUMAR, J)

Writ petition is for a mandamus, directing the respondents to re classify S.F.Nos.1001, Varapatty Village, Sulur Taluk, Coimbatore District as Tank Poramboke and maintain the same as Tank

Poramboke without any assignment to any individual.

2. Representation dated 23.05.2015 is stated to have been given by the villagers of Varapatty Village, objecting to the assignment of lands to landless Adidraavidars. Though, petitioner has contended that a Tank Poramboke has been classified as Natham Poramboke, for assignment of lands to landless Adidraavidars in Varapatty Village, reading of the representation dated 23.05.2015 indicates that the primary objection of the villagers is that if lands are assigned to Adidraavidars, in the places earmarked, there is a likelihood of communal clash.

3. In addition to the above, in the representation dated 23.05.2015, petitioner has contended that classification of the land earmarked as 'Natham Poramboke' is not in accordance with the procedure contemplated under the Standing Orders of the Board of Revenue. Reference has been made to Standing Order No.16 of the Board of Revenue, which is extracted hereunder

"16. Disposal of tank-bed lands.

Notes-- (1) No land belonging to Government shall be sold under the Standing order, to any person other than a citizen of India, except with the sanction of the Collector of the Board and with the previous permission of Government. Every sale under this Standing Order shall be subject to the condition that if the land is placed at the disposal of a company, association, society, institution, or a local body or transferred to any person other than a citizen of India, without the sanction of the Government, the sale shall thereupon become null and void.

No application for sale of Government land under this Standing Order to a company, association or society should be considered unless such company, association or society is a company within the meaning of that word in section 3(1)(i) of the Companies Act, 1956 (Central Act XXI of 1860), the Religious Societies Act, 1880 (Central Act I of 1880), the Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies Act, 1961 (Tamil Nadu Act 53 of 1961), Multi-Unit Co-operative Societies Act, 1942 (Central Act VI of 1942), the Insurance Act, 1938 (Central Act IV of 1938), the Indian Trade Union Act, 1926 (Central Act) XVI of 1926 or by an Act of Parliament of the Union of India or of the State Legislature in the Union of India. The above order insisting on registration does not apply to Roman Catholic Churches, Dioceses other Roman Catholic Missions and Congress Organizations."

4. Going through the material on record, we find that there is no supporting document to substantiate the material fact that the land earmarked, was once a Tank Poramboke and reclassified as 'Natham Poramboke'. Representation of the year 2015, would not give rise to a cause of action, to file a writ petition in 2018. Needless to state that writ petition is also hit by delay and laches. Writ petition has not been filed within a reasonable time after making representation.

5. Laches or reasonable time are not defined under any Statute or Rules. "Laches" or "Lashes" is an old french word for slackness or negligence or not doing. In general sense, it means neglect to do what in the law should have been done for an unreasonable or unexplained length of time. What could be the laches in one case might not constitute in another.

6. What is reasonable time has not been explained in any of the enactment. Reasonable time depends upon the facts and circumstances of each case.

(i) The words "reasonable time", as explained in *Veerayeeammal v. Seeniammal* reported in 2002 (1) SCC 134, at Paragraph 13, is as follows:

"13. The word [reasonable] has in law prima facie meaning of reasonable in regard to those circumstances of which the person concerned is called upon to act reasonably knows or ought to know as to what was reasonable. It may be unreasonable to give an exact definition of the word [reasonable]. The reason varies in its conclusion according to idiosyncrasy of the individual and the time and circumstances in which he thinks. The dictionary meaning of the [reasonable time] is to be so much time as is necessary, under the circumstances, to do conveniently what the contract or duty

requires should be done in a particular case. In other words it means, as soon as circumstances permit. In P. Ramanatha Aiyar's The Law Lexicon it is defined to mean:

"A reasonable time, looking at all the circumstances of the case; a reasonable time under ordinary circumstances; as soon as circumstances will permit; so much time as is necessary under the circumstances, conveniently to do what the contract requires should be done; some more protracted space than "directly"; such length of time as may fairly, and properly, and reasonably be allowed or required, having regard to the nature of the act or duty and to the attending circumstances; all these convey more or less the same idea."

7. Reference can also be made to few decisions of the Supreme Court, where inordinate delay and laches, on the part of the litigant in approaching the Court has been disapproved:

(i) In State of M.P. v. Bhailal Bhai reported in AIR 1964 SC 1006, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that unreasonable delay denies to the petitioner the discretionary extraordinary remedy of mandamus, certiorari or any other relief.

(ii) In State of M.P., v. Nandlal Jaismal reported in 1986 (4) SCC 566, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, at Paragraph 24, held as follows:

"24. Now, it is well settled that the power of the High Court to issue an appropriate writ under Article 226 of the Constitution is discretionary and the High Court in the exercise of its discretion does not ordinarily assist the tardy and the indolent or the acquiescent and the lethargic. If there is inordinate delay on the part of the petitioner in filing a writ petition and such delay is not satisfactorily explained, the High Court may decline to intervene and grant relief in the exercise of its writ jurisdiction. The evolution of this rule of laches or delay is premised upon a number of factors. The High Court does not ordinarily permit a belated resort to the extraordinary remedy under the writ jurisdiction because it is likely to cause confusion and public inconvenience and bring in its train new injustices. The rights of third parties may intervene and if the writ jurisdiction is exercised on a writ petition filed after unreasonable delay, it may have the effect of inflicting not only hardship and inconvenience but also injustice on third parties. When the writ jurisdiction of the High Court is invoked, unexplained delay coupled with the creation of third party rights in the meanwhile is an important factor which always weighs the High Court in deciding whether or not to exercise such jurisdiction. We do not think it necessary to burden this judgment with reference to various decisions of this Court where it has been emphasised time and again that where there is inordinate and unexplained delay and third party rights are created in the intervening period, the High Court would decline to interfere, even if the State action complained of is unconstitutional or illegal.Of course, this rule of laches or delay is not a rigid rule which can be cast in a strait jacket formula, for there may be cases where despite delay and creation of third party rights the High Court may still in the exercise of its discretion interfere and grant relief to the petitioner. But, such cases where the demand of justice is so compelling that the High Court would be inclined to interfere in spite of delay or creation of third party rights would by their very nature be few and far between. Ultimately it would be a matter within the discretion of the court; ex hypothesi every discretion must be exercised fairly and justly so as to promote justice and not to defeat it."

(iii) In State of Maharashtra v. Digambar reported in AIR 1995 SC 1991, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, considered a case, where compensation for the acquired land was claimed belatedly and at Paragraphs 12, 18 and 21, held as follows:

"12. How a person who alleges against the State of deprivation of his legal right, can get relief of compensation from the State invoking writ jurisdiction of the High Court under article 226 of the Constitution even though, he is guilty of laches or undue delay is difficult to comprehend, when it is well settled by decision of this Court that no person, be he a citizen or otherwise, is entitled to obtain the equitable relief under Article 226 of the Constitution if his conduct is blame-worthy

because of laches, undue delay, acquiescence, waiver and the like. Moreover, how a citizen claiming discretionary relief under Article 226 of the Constitution against a State, could be relieved of his obligation to establish his unblameworthy conduct for getting such relief, where the State against which relief is sought is a welfare State, is also difficult to comprehend. Where the relief sought under Article 226 of the Constitution by a person against the welfare State is founded on its alleged illegal or wrongful executive action, the need to explain laches or undue delay on his part to obtain such relief, should, if anything, be more stringent than in other cases, for the reason that the State due to laches or undue delay on the part of the person seeking relief, may not be able to show that the executive action complained of was legal or correct for want of records pertaining to the action or for the officers who were responsible for such action not being available later on. Further, where granting of relief is claimed against the State on alleged unwarranted executive action, is bound to result in loss to the public exchequer of the State or in damage to other public interest, the High Court before granting such relief is required to satisfy itself that the delay or laches on the part of a citizen or any other person in approaching for relief under Article 226 of the Constitution on the alleged violation of his legal right, was wholly justified in the facts and circumstances, instead of ignoring the same or leniently considering it. Thus, in our view, persons seeking relief against the State under Article 226 of the Constitution, be they citizens or otherwise, cannot get discretionary relief obtainable thereunder unless they fully satisfy the High Court that the facts and circumstances of the case clearly justified the laches or undue delay on their part in approaching the Court for grant of such discretionary relief. Therefore, where a High Court grants relief to a citizen or any other person under Article 226 of the Constitution against any person including the State without considering his blame-worthy conduct, such as laches or undue delay, acquiescence or waiver, the relief so granted becomes unsustainable even if the relief was granted in respect of alleged deprivation of his legal right by the State.

18. Laches or undue delay, the blame-worthy conduct of a person in approaching a Court of Equity in England for obtaining discretionary relief which disentitled for grant of such relief was explained succinctly by Sir Barnes Peacock, long ago, in *Lindsay Petroleum Co. v. Prosper Armstrong* (1874) 5 PC 221) thus :

"Now the doctrine of laches in Courts of Equity is not an arbitrary or a technical doctrine. Where it would be practically unjust to give a remedy, either because the party has, by his conduct, done that which might fairly be regarded as equivalent to a waiver of it, or where by his conduct and neglect he has, though perhaps not waiving that remedy, yet put the other party in a situation, in which it would not be reasonable to place him if the remedy were afterwards to be asserted, in either of these cases, lapse of time and delay are most material. But in every case, if an argument against relief, which otherwise would be just, is founded upon mere delay, that delay of course not amounting to a bar by any statute or limitations, the validity of that defence must be tried upon principles substantially equitable. Two circumstances, always important in such cases, are, the length of the delay and the nature of the acts done during the interval, which might affect either party and cause a balance of Justice or injustice in taking the one course or the other, so far as it relates to the remedy."

21. Therefore, where a High Court in exercise of its power vested under Article 226 of the Constitution issues a direction, order or writ for granting relief to a person including a citizen without considering his disentitlement of such relief due to his blameworthy conduct of undue delay or laches in claiming the same, such a direction, order or writ becomes unsustainable as that not made judiciously and reasonably in exercise of its sound judicial discretion, but as that made arbitrarily."

(iv) In *State of Rajasthan v. D.R. Laxmi* reported in 1996 (6) SCC 445, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that though the order may be void, if the party does not approach the Court within a reasonable time, which is always a question of fact and have the order invalidated or acquiesced or waived, the discretion of the Court has to be exercised in a reasonable manner.

(v) In *Chairman, U.P. Jal Nigam and another v. Jaswant Singh* reported in AIR 2007 SC 924, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, after considering a catena of decisions on the aspect of delay, at Paragraph 13, held as follows:

"13.....Therefore, whenever it appears that the claimants lost time or while away and did not rise to the occasion in time for filing the writ petitions, then in such cases, the Court should be very slow in granting the relief to the incumbent. Secondly, it has also to be taken into consideration the question of acquiescence or waiver on the part of the incumbent whether other parties are going to be prejudiced if the relief is granted."

(vi) In *S.S. Balu v. State of Kerala*, (2009) 2 SCC 479, wherein at paragraph No.17, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as follows:

"17. It is also well-settled principle of law that "delay defeats equity". The Government Order was issued on 15-1-2002. The appellants did not file any writ application questioning the legality and validity thereof. Only after the writ petitions filed by others were allowed and the State of Kerala preferred an appeal thereagainst, they impleaded themselves as party-respondents. It is now a trite law that where the writ petitioner approaches the High Court after a long delay, reliefs prayed for may be denied to them on the ground of delay and laches irrespective of the fact that they are similarly situated to the other candidates who obtain the benefit of the judgment. It is, thus, not possible for us to issue any direction to the State of Kerala or the Commission to appoint the appellants at this stage. In *NDMC v. Pan Singh* this Court held: (SCC p. 283, para 16)

"16. There is another aspect of the matter which cannot be lost sight of. The respondents herein filed a writ petition after 17 years. They did not agitate their grievances for a long time. They, as noticed herein, did not claim parity with the 17 workmen at the earliest possible opportunity. They did not implead themselves as parties even in the reference made by the State before the Industrial Tribunal. It is not their case that after 1982, those employees who were employed or who were recruited after the cut-off date have been granted the said scale of pay. After such a long time, therefore, the writ petitions could not have been entertained even if they are similarly situated. It is trite that the discretionary jurisdiction may not be exercised in favour of those who approach the court after a long time. Delay and laches are relevant factors for exercise of equitable jurisdiction."

8. We also deem it fit to consider the law on Public Interest Litigations. (i) In *S.P. Anand v. H.D. Deve Gowda* reported in 1996 (6) SCC 734, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, at Paragraph 18, held as follows: "It is of utmost importance that those who invoke this Court's jurisdiction seeking a waiver of the locus standi rule must exercise restraint in moving the Court by not plunging in areas wherein they are not well-versed. Such a litigant must not succumb to spasmodic sentiments and behave like a knight-errant roaming at will in pursuit of issues providing publicity. He must remember that as a person seeking to espouse a public cause, he owes it to the public as well as to the court that he does not rush to court without undertaking a research, even if he is qualified or competent to raise the issue. Besides, it must be remembered that a good cause can be lost if petitions are filed on half-baked information without proper research or by persons who are not qualified and competent to raise such issues as the rejection of such a petition may affect third party rights. Lastly, it must also be borne in mind that no one has a right to the waiver of the locus standi rule and the court should permit it only when it is satisfied that the carriage of proceedings is in the competent hands of a person who is genuinely concerned in public interest and is not moved by other extraneous considerations. So also the court must be careful to ensure that the process of the Court is not sought to be abused by a person who desires to persist with his point of view, almost carrying it to the point of obstinacy, by filling a series of petitions refusing to accept the Court's earlier decisions as concluding the point. We say this because when we drew the attention of the petitioner to earlier decisions of this Court, he brushed them aside, without so much as showing willingness to deal with them and without giving them a second look, as having become stale and irrelevant by passage of time and challenged their correctness on the specious plea that they needed reconsideration. Except

for saying that they needed reconsideration he had no answer to the correctness of the decisions. Such a casual approach to considered decisions of this Court even by a person well-versed in law would not be countenanced. Instead, as pointed out earlier, he referred to decisions having no bearing on the question, like the decisions on cow slaughter cases, freedom of speech and expression, uniform civil code, etc., we need say no more except to point out that indiscriminate of this important lever of public interest litigation would blunt the lever itself."

(ii) In *Balco Employees' Union (Regd.) v. Union of India* reported in 2002 (2) SCC 333, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, held that,

"Public interest litigation, or PIL as it is more commonly known, entered the Indian judicial process in 1970. It will not be incorrect to say that it is primarily the judges who have innovated this type of litigation as there was a dire need for it. At that stage, it was intended to vindicate public interest where fundamental and other rights of the people who were poor, ignorant or in socially or economically disadvantageous position and were unable to seek legal redress were required to be espoused. PIL was not meant to be adversarial in nature and was to be a cooperative and collaborative effort of the parties and the court so as to secure justice for the poor and the weaker sections of the community who were not in a position to protect their own interests. Public interest litigation was intended to mean nothing more than what words themselves said viz. "litigation in the interest of the public."

(iii) In *Ashok Kumar Pandey v. State of W.B.*, reported in 2004 (3) SCC 349, the Hon'ble Apex Court, after considering few decisions, on the aspect of public interest litigation, observed as follows:

"4. When there is material to show that a petition styled as a public interest litigation is nothing but a camouflage to foster personal disputes, said petition is to be thrown out. Before we grapple with the issue involved in the present case, we feel it necessary to consider the issue regarding public interest aspect. Public Interest Litigation which has now come to occupy an important field in the administration of law should not be "publicity interest litigation" or "private interest litigation" or "politics interest litigation" or the latest trend "paise income litigation". If not properly regulated and abuse averted it becomes also a tool in unscrupulous hands to release vendetta and wreck vengeance, as well. There must be real and genuine public interest involved in the litigation and not merely an adventure of knight errant or poke ones into for a probe. It cannot also be invoked by a person or a body of persons to further his or their personal causes or satisfy his or their personal grudge and enmity. Courts of justice should not be allowed to be polluted by unscrupulous litigants by resorting to the extraordinary jurisdiction. A person acting bona fide and having sufficient interest in the proceeding of public interest litigation will alone have a locus standi and can approach the Court to wipe out violation of fundamental rights and genuine infraction of statutory provisions, but not for personal gain or private profit or political motive or any oblique consideration. These aspects were highlighted by this Court in *The Janta Dal v. H.S.Chowdhary* [1992 (4) SCC 305] and *Kazi Lhendup Dorji vs. Central Bureau of Investigation* (1994 Supp (2) SCC 116). A writ petitioner who comes to the Court for relief in public interest must come not only with clean hands like any other writ petitioner but also with a clean heart, clean mind and clean objective. See *Ramjas Foundation v. Union of India* (AIR 1993 SC 852) and *K.R.Srinivas v. R.M.Premchand* (1994 (6) SCC 620).

5. It is necessary to take note of the meaning of expression 'public interest litigation'. In Strouds Judicial Dictionary, Volume 4 (IV Edition), 'Public Interest' is defined thus:

"Public Interest (1) a matter of public or general interest does not mean that which is interesting as gratifying curiosity or a love of information or amusement but that in which a class of the community have a pecuniary interest, or some interest by which their legal rights or liabilities are affected."

6. In Black's Law Dictionary (Sixth Edition), "public interest" is defined as follows :

"Public Interest something in which the public, or some interest by which their legal rights or liabilities are affected. It does not mean anything the particular localities, which may be affected by

the matters in question. Interest shared by national government...."

7. In Janata Dal case (supra) this Court considered the scope of public interest litigation. In para 52 of the said judgment, after considering what is public interest, has laid down as follows :

"The expression 'litigation' means a legal action including all proceedings therein initiated in a Court of law for the enforcement of right or seeking a remedy. Therefore, lexically the expression "PIL" means the legal action initiated in a Court of law for the enforcement of public interest or general interest in which the public or a class of the community have pecuniary interest or some interest by which their legal rights or liabilities are affected."

8. In paras 60, 61 and 62 of the said judgment, it was pointed out as follows:

"Be that as it may, it is needless to emphasize that the requirement of locus standi of a party to a litigation is mandatory, because the legal capacity of the party to any litigation whether in private or public action in relation to any specific remedy sought for has to be primarily ascertained at the threshold."

9. In para 96 of the said judgment, it has further been pointed out as follows:

"While this Court has laid down a chain of notable decisions with all emphasis at their command about the importance and significance of this newly developed doctrine of PIL, it has also hastened to sound a red alert and a note of severe warning that Courts should not allow its process to be abused by a mere busy body or a meddlesome interloper or wayfarer or officious intervener without any interest or concern except for personal gain or private profit or other oblique consideration."

10. In subsequent paras of the said judgment, it was observed as follows:

"109. It is thus clear that only a person acting bona fide and having sufficient interest in the proceeding of PIL will alone have as locus standi and can approach the Court to wipe out the tears of the poor and needy, suffering from violation of their fundamental rights, but not a person for personal gain or private profit or political motive or any oblique consideration. Similarly a vexatious petition under the colour of PIL, brought before the Court for vindicating any personal grievance, deserves rejection at the threshold".

11. It is depressing to note that on account of such trumpery proceedings initiated before the Courts, innumerable days are wasted, which time otherwise could have been spent for the disposal of cases of the genuine litigants. Though we spare no efforts in fostering and developing the laudable concept of PIL and extending our long arm of sympathy to the poor, the ignorant, the oppressed and the needy whose fundamental rights are infringed and violated and whose grievance go unnoticed, un-represented and unheard; yet we cannot avoid but express our opinion that while genuine litigants with legitimate grievances relating to civil matters involving properties worth hundreds of millions of rupees and criminal cases in which persons sentenced to death facing gallows under untold agony and persons sentenced to life imprisonment and kept in incarceration for long years, persons suffering from undue delay in service matters - government or private, persons awaiting the disposal of cases wherein huge amounts of public revenue or unauthorized collection of tax amounts are locked up, detenu expecting their release from the detention orders etc. etc. are all standing in a long serpentine queue for years with the fond hope of getting into the Courts and having their grievances redressed, the busy bodies, meddlesome interlopers, wayfarers or officious interveners having absolutely no public interest except for personal gain or private profit either of themselves or as a proxy of others or for any other extraneous motivation or for glare of publicity break the queue muffing their faces by wearing the mask of public interest litigation and get into the Courts by filing vexatious and frivolous petitions and thus criminally waste the valuable time of the Courts and as a result of which the queue standing outside the doors of the court never moves, which piquant situation creates frustration in the minds of the genuine litigants and resultantly they loose faith in the administration of our judicial system.

12. Public interest litigation is a weapon which has to be used with great care and circumspection and the judiciary has to be extremely careful to see that behind the beautiful veil of public interest an ugly private malice, vested interest and/or publicity seeking is not lurking. It is to be used as an effective weapon in the armory of law for delivering social justice to the citizens. The attractive

brand name of public interest litigation should not be used for suspicious products of mischief. It should be aimed at redressal of genuine public wrong or public injury and not publicity oriented or founded on personal vendetta. As indicated above, Court must be careful to see that a body of persons or member of public, who approaches the court is acting bona fide and not for personal gain or private motive or political motivation or other oblique consideration. The Court must not allow its process to be abused for oblique considerations. Some persons with vested interest indulge in the pastime of meddling with judicial process either by force of habit or from improper motives. Often they are actuated by a desire to win notoriety or cheap popularity. The petitions of such busy bodies deserve to be thrown out by rejection at the threshold, and in appropriate cases with exemplary costs.

13. The Council for Public Interest Law set up by the Ford Foundation in USA defined the "public interest litigation" in its report of Public Interest Law, USA, 1976 as follows:

"Public Interest Law is the name that has recently been given to efforts provide legal representation to previously unrepresented groups and interests. Such efforts have been undertaken in the recognition that ordinary market place for legal services fails to provide such services to significant segments of the population and to significant interests. Such groups and interests include the proper environmentalists, consumers, racial and ethnic minorities and others."

14. The Court has to be satisfied about (a) the credentials of the applicant; (b) the prima facie correctness or nature of information given by him; (c) the information being not vague and indefinite. The information should show gravity and seriousness involved. Court has to strike balance between two conflicting interests; (i) nobody should be allowed to indulge in wild and reckless allegations besmirching the character of others; and (ii) avoidance of public mischief and to avoid mischievous petitions seeking to assail, for oblique motives, justifiable executive actions. In such case, however, the Court cannot afford to be liberal. It has to be extremely careful to see that under the guise of redressing a public grievance, it does not encroach upon the sphere reserved by the Constitution to the Executive and the Legislature. The Court has to act ruthlessly while dealing with imposters and busy bodies or meddlesome interlopers impersonating as public-spirited holy men. They masquerade as crusaders of justice. They pretend to act in the name of Pro Bono Publico, though they have no interest of the public or even of their own to protect.

15. Courts must do justice by promotion of good faith, and prevent law from crafty invasions. Courts must maintain the social balance by interfering where necessary for the sake of justice and refuse to interfere where it is against the social interest and public good. (See *State of Maharastra v. Prabhu* [(1994 (2) SCC 481)] and *Andra Pradesh State Financial Corporation v. M/s.GAR Re-Rolling Mills and Another* [AIR 1994 SC 2151]. No litigant has a right to unlimited drought on the Court time and public money in order to get his affairs settled in the manner as he wishes. Easy access to justice should not be misused as a licence to file misconceived and frivolous petitions. [See *Buddhi Kota Subbarao (Dr.) v. K.Parasaran*, (1996) 7 JT 265]. Today people rush to Courts to file cases in profusion under this attractive name of public interest. They must inspire confidence in Courts and among the public.

16. As noted supra, a time has come to weed out the petitions, which though titled as public interest litigations are in essence something else. It is shocking to note that Courts are flooded with large number of so called public interest litigations where even a minuscule percentage can legitimately be called as public interest litigations. Though the parameters of public interest litigation have been indicated by this Court in large number of cases, yet unmindful of the real intentions and objectives, Courts are entertaining such petitions and wasting valuable judicial time which, as noted above, could be otherwise utilized for disposal of genuine cases. Though in *Dr.Duryodhan Sahu and Ors., v. Jitendra Kumar Mishra and Ors.*, (AIR 1999 SC 114), this Court held that in service matters PILs should not be entertained, the inflow of so- called PILs involving service matters continues unabated in the Courts and strangely are entertained. The least the High Courts could do is to throw them out on the basis of the said decision. The other interesting aspect is that in the PILs, official documents are being annexed without even indicating as to how the petitioner came to possess them. In one

case, it was noticed that an interesting answer was given as to its possession. It was stated that a packet was lying on the road and when out of curiosity the petitioner opened it, he found copies of the official documents. Whenever such frivolous pleas are taken to explain possession, the Court should do well not only to dismiss the petitions but also to impose exemplary costs. It would be desirable for the Courts to filter out the frivolous petitions and dismiss them with costs as afore-stated so that the message goes in the right direction that petitions filed with oblique motive do not have the approval of the Courts.

17.

18. In *S.P.Gupta v. Union of India* [1981 Supp. SCC 87], it was emphatically pointed out that the relaxation of the rule of locus standi in the field of PIL does not give any right to a busybody or meddlesome interloper to approach the Court under the guise of a public interest litigant. He has also left the following note of caution: (SCC p.219, para 24)

"But we must be careful to see that the member of the public, who approaches the court in cases of this kind, is acting bona fide and not for personal gain or private profit or political motivation or other oblique consideration. The court must not allow its process to be abused by politicians and others to delay legitimate administrative action or to gain a political objective."

19. In *State of H.P. vs. A Parent of a Student of Medical College, Simla and Ors.* (1985 (3) SCC 169), it has been said that public interest litigation is a weapon which has to be used with great care and circumspection.

20. Khalid, J. in his separate supplementing judgment in *Sachidanand Pandey vs. State of W.B.*, (1987 (2) SCC 295, 331) said:

"Today public spirited litigants rush to courts to file cases in profusion under this attractive name. They must inspire confidence in courts and among the public. They must be above suspicion. (SCC p. 331, para 46)

* * *

Public interest litigation has now come to stay. But one is led to think that it poses a threat to courts and public alike. Such cases are now filed without any rhyme or reason. It is, therefore, necessary to lay down clear guidelines and to outline the correct parameters for entertainment of such petitions. If courts do not restrict the free flow of such cases in the name of public interest litigations, the traditional litigation will suffer and the courts of law, instead of dispensing justice, will have to take upon themselves administrative and executive functions. (SCC p.334, para 59)

* * *

I will be second to none in extending help when such help is required. But this does not mean that the doors of this Court are always open for anyone to walk in. It is necessary to have some self-imposed restraint on public interest litigants." (SCC p.335, para 61)

21. Sabyasachi Mukharji, J. (as he then was) speaking for the Bench in *ramsharan Autyanuprasi v. Union of India* (1989 Supp (1) SCC 251), was in full agreement with the view expressed by Khalid, J. in *Sachidanand Pandey's* case (supra) and added that 'public interest litigation' is an instrument of the administration of justice to be used properly in proper cases. [See also separate judgment by Pathak, J. (as he then was) in *Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India* (1984 (3) SCC 161).

22. Sarkaria, J. in *Jasbhai Motibhai Desai v. Roshan Kumar* (1976 (1) SCC 671) expressed his view that the application of the busybody should be rejected at the threshold in the following terms: (SCC p. 683, para 37)

"It will be seen that in the context of locus standi to apply for a writ of certiorari, an applicant may ordinarily fall in any of these categories : (i) 'person aggrieved'; (ii) 'stranger'; (iii) busybody or meddlesome interloper. Persons in the last category are easily distinguishable from those coming under the first two categories. Such persons interfere in things which do not concern them. They masquerade as crusaders for justice. They pretend to act in the name of pro bono publico, though they have no interest of the public or even of their own to protect. They indulge in the pastime of meddling with the judicial process either by force of habit or from improper motives. Often, they are actuated by a desire to win notoriety or cheap popularity; while the ulterior intent of some

applicants in this category, may be no more than spoking the wheels of administration. The High Court should do well to reject the applications of such busybodies at the threshold."

23. Krishna Iyer, J. in *Fertilizer Corpn. Kamgar Union (Regd.) v. Union of India* (1981 (1) SCC 568) in stronger terms stated: (SCC p.589, para 48)

"48. If a citizen is no more than a wayfarer or officious intervener without any interest or concern beyond what belongs to any one of the 660 million people of this country, the door of the court will not be ajar for him."

24. In *Chhetriya Pardushan Mukti Sangharash Samiti v. State of U.P.*, (1990 (4) SCC 449), Sabyasachi Mukharji, C.J. observed: (SCC p.452, para 8)

"While it is the duty of this Court to enforce fundamental rights, it is also the duty of this Court to ensure that this weapon under Article 32 should not be misused or permitted to be misused creating a bottleneck in the superior court preventing other genuine violation of fundamental rights being considered by the court."

25. In *Union Carbide Corporation v. Union of India* (1991 (4) SCC 584, 610), Ranganath Mishra, C.J. in his separate judgment while concurring with the conclusions of the majority judgment has said thus: (SCC p.610, para 21)

"I am prepared to assume, nay, concede, that public activists should also be permitted to espouse the cause of the poor citizens but there must be a limit set to such activity and nothing perhaps should be done which would affect the dignity of the Court and bring down the serviceability of the institution to the people at large. Those who are acquainted with jurisprudence and enjoy social privilege as men educated in law owe an obligation to the community of educating it properly and allowing the judicial process to continue unsoiled."

26 In *Subhash Kumar v. State of Bihar*, (1991 (1) SCC 598) it was observed as follows:

"Public interest litigation cannot be invoked by a person or body of persons to satisfy his or its personal grudge and enmity. If such petitions under Article 32, are entertained it would amount to abuse of process of the court, preventing speedy remedy to other genuine petitioners from this Court. Personal interest cannot be enforced through the process of this Court under Article 32 of the Constitution in the garb of a public interest litigation. Public interest litigation contemplates legal proceeding for vindication or enforcement of fundamental rights of a group of persons or community which are not able to enforce their fundamental rights on account of their incapacity, poverty or ignorance of law. A person invoking the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 32 must approach this Court for the vindication of the fundamental rights of affected persons and not for the purpose of vindication of his personal grudge or enmity. It is the duty of this Court to discourage such petitions and to ensure that the course of justice is not obstructed or polluted by unscrupulous litigants by invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court for personal matters under the garb of the public interest litigation".

27. In the words of Bhagwati, J. (as he then was) "the courts must be careful in entertaining public interest litigations" or in the words of Sarkaria, J. "the applications of the busybodies should be rejected at the threshold itself" and as Krishna Iyer, J. has pointed out, "the doors of the courts should not be ajar for such vexatious litigants".

(iv) In *Vikas Vashishth v. Allahabad High Court* reported in 2004 (13) SCC 485, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as follows:

"At the very outset, we put it to the petitioner that a bare perusal of the petition shows that it is based entirely on newspaper reports and asked him whether before filing the petition he has taken care to verify the facts personally. His answer is in the negative. In the writ petition all the 21 High Courts have been included as respondents and Union of India has also been impleaded as the 22nd respondent. We asked the petitioner what has provoked him to implead all the High Courts as respondents and he states that it is his apprehension that similar incidents may occur in other High Courts though there is no factual foundation for such appreciation.

5. After affording the full opportunity of hearing, we are satisfied that what purports to have been

filed as a public interest litigation is nothing more than a "publicity interest litigation". It is writ large that it has been filed without any effort at verifying the facts by the petitioner personally."

(v) In *R & M.Trust v. Koramangala Residents Vigilance Group* reported in 2005 (3) SCC 91, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, at Paragraphs 23 and 24, observed as follows:

"23. Next question is whether such Public Interest Litigation should at all be entertained & laches thereon. This sacrosanct jurisdiction of Public Interest Litigation should be invoked very sparingly and in favour of vigilant litigant and not for the persons who invoke this jurisdiction for the sake of publicity or for the purpose of serving their private ends.

24. Public Interest Litigation is no doubt a very useful handle for redressing the grievances of the people but unfortunately lately it has been abused by some interested persons and it has brought very bad name. Courts should be very very slow in entertaining petitions involving public interest in a very rare cases where public at large stand to suffer. This jurisdiction is meant for the purpose of coming to the rescue of the down trodden and not for the purpose of serving private ends. It has now become common for unscrupulous people to serve their private ends and jeopardize the rights of innocent people so as to wreak vengeance for their personal ends. This has become very handy to the developers and in matters of public contracts. In order to serve their professional rivalry they utilize the service of the innocent people or organization in filing public interest litigation. The Courts are sometimes persuaded to issue certain directions without understanding implication and giving a handle in the hands of the authorities to misuse it. Therefore, the courts should not exercise this jurisdiction lightly but should exercise in a very rare and few cases involving public interest of large number of people who cannot afford litigation and are made to suffer at the hands of the authorities."

(vi) In *Gurpal Singh v. State of Punjab* reported in 2005 (5) SCC 136, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, while considering the scope of a petition styled as a public interest litigation, held as follows:

"5. The scope of entertaining a petition styled as a public interest litigation, locus standi of the petitioner particularly in matters involving service of an employee has been examined by this court in various cases. The Court has to be satisfied about (a) the credentials of the applicant; (b) the prima facie correctness or nature of information given by him; (c) the information being not vague and indefinite. The information should show gravity and seriousness involved. Court has to strike balance between two conflicting interests; (i) nobody should be allowed to indulge in wild and reckless allegations besmirching the character of others; and (ii) avoidance of public mischief and to avoid mischievous petitions seeking to assail, for oblique motives, justifiable executive actions. In such case, however, the Court cannot afford to be liberal. It has to be extremely careful to see that under the guise of redressing a public grievance, it does not encroach upon the sphere reserved by the Constitution to the Executive and the Legislature. The Court has to act ruthlessly while dealing with imposters and busy bodies or meddlesome interlopers impersonating as public-spirited holy men. They masquerade as crusaders of justice. They pretend to act in the name of Pro Bono Publico, though they have no interest of the public or even of their own to protect.

6.

7. As noted supra, a time has come to weed out the petitions, which though titled as public interest litigations are in essence something else. It is shocking to note that Courts are flooded with large number of so called public interest litigations where even a minuscule percentage can legitimately be called as public interest litigations. Though the parameters of public interest litigation have been indicated by this Court in large number of cases, yet unmindful of the real intentions and objectives, High Courts are entertaining such petitions and wasting valuable judicial time which, as noted above, could be otherwise utilized for disposal of genuine cases. Though in *Dr. Duryodhan Sahu and Ors. v. Jitendra Kumar Mishra and Ors.* (AIR 1999 SC 114), this Court held that in service matters PILs should not be entertained, the inflow of so-called PILs involving service matters continues unabated in the Courts and strangely are entertained. The least the High Courts could do is to throw

them out on the basis of the said decision. The other interesting aspect is that in the PILs, official documents are being annexed without even indicating as to how the petitioner came to possess them. In one case, it was noticed that an interesting answer was given as to its possession. It was stated that a packet was lying on the road and when out of curiosity the petitioner opened it, he found copies of the official documents. Whenever such frivolous pleas are taken to explain possession, the Court should do well not only to dismiss the petitions but also to impose exemplary costs. It would be desirable for the Courts to filter out the frivolous petitions and dismiss them with costs as afore-stated so that the message goes in the right direction that petitions filed with oblique motive do not have the approval of the Courts.

8.

9. It is depressing to note that on account of such trumpery proceedings initiated before the Courts, innumerable days are wasted, which time otherwise could have been spent for the disposal of cases of the genuine litigants. Though we spare no efforts in fostering and developing the laudable concept of PIL and extending our long arm of sympathy to the poor, the ignorant, the oppressed and the needy whose fundamental rights are infringed and violated and whose grievance go unnoticed, unrepresented and unheard; yet we cannot avoid but express our opinion that while genuine litigants with legitimate grievances relating to civil matters involving properties worth hundreds of millions of rupees and substantial rights and criminal cases in which persons sentenced to death facing gallows under untold agony and persons sentenced to life imprisonment and kept in incarceration for long years, persons suffering from undue delay in service matters - government or private, persons awaiting the disposal of tax cases wherein huge amounts of public revenue or unauthorized collection of tax amounts are locked up, detenu expecting their release from the detention orders etc. etc. are all standing in a long serpentine queue for years with the fond hope of getting into the Courts and having their grievances redressed, the busy bodies, meddlesome interlopers, wayfarers or officious interveners having absolutely no real public interest except for personal gain or private profit either of themselves or as a proxy of others or for any other extraneous motivation or for glare of publicity break the queue muffing their faces by wearing the mask of public interest litigation and get into the Courts by filing vexatious and frivolous petitions of luxury litigants who have nothing to loose but trying to gain for nothing and thus criminally waste the valuable time of the Courts and as a result of which the queue standing outside the doors of the court never moves, which piquant situation creates frustration in the minds of the genuine litigants.

10. Public interest litigation is a weapon which has to be used with great care and circumspection and the judiciary has to be extremely careful to see that behind the beautiful veil of public interest an ugly private malice, vested interest and/or publicity seeking is not lurking. It is to be used as an effective weapon in the armory of law for delivering social justice to the citizens. The attractive brand name of public interest litigation should not be allowed to be used for suspicious products of mischief. It should be aimed at redressal of genuine public wrong or public injury and not publicity oriented or founded on personal vendetta. As indicated above, Court must be careful to see that a body of persons or member of public, who approaches the court is acting bona fide and not for personal gain or private motive or political motivation or other oblique consideration. The Court must not allow its process to be abused for oblique considerations by masked phantoms who monitor at times from behind. Some persons with vested interest indulge in the pastime of meddling with judicial process either by force of habit or from improper motives and try to bargain for a good deal as well to enrich themselves. Often they are actuated by a desire to win notoriety or cheap popularity. The petitions of such busy bodies deserve to be thrown out by rejection at the threshold, and in appropriate cases with exemplary costs."

(vii) In *Common Cause (A Regd. Society) v. Union of India* reported in 2008 (5) SCC 511, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Markandey Katju (as he then was), held as follows:

"59. Unfortunately, the truth is that PILs are being entertained by many courts as a routine and the result is that the dockets of most of the superior courts are flooded with PILs, most of which are

frivolous or for which the judiciary has no remedy. As stated in *Dattaraj Nathuji Thaware v. State of Maharashtra* reported in AIR 2005 SC 540, public interest litigation has nowadays largely become 'publicity interest litigation', 'private interest litigation', or 'politics interest litigation' or the latest trend 'paise income litigation'. Much of P.I.L. is really blackmail.

60. Thus, Public Interest Litigation which was initially created as a useful judicial tool to help the poor and weaker section of society who could not afford to come to courts, has, in course of time, largely developed into an uncontrollable Frankenstein and a nuisance which is threatening to choke the dockets of the superior courts obstructing the hearing of the genuine and regular cases which have been waiting to be taken up for years together."

In the same judgment, concurring with the view of his Brother Judge, Hon'ble Mr. Justice H.K.Sema (as he then was), further added, as follows:

"69. Therefore, whether to entertain the petition in the form of Public Interest Litigation either represented by public-spirited person; or private interest litigation in the guise of public interest litigation; or publicity interest litigation; or political interest litigation is to be examined in the facts and circumstances recited in the petition itself. I am also of the view that if there is a buffer zone unoccupied by the legislature or executive which is detrimental to the public interest, judiciary must occupy the field to subserve public interest. Therefore, each case has to be examined on its own facts."

(viii) In *Adarsh Shiksha Mahavidyalaya v. Subhash Rahangdale* reported in 2012 (2) SCC 425, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as follows:

"57. In the light of the above, we shall first consider whether the High Court committed an error by entertaining the writ petition filed by Subhash Rahangdale as public interest litigation. This Court has, time and again, laid down guiding principles for entertaining petitions filed in public interest. However, for the purpose of deciding the appellants' objection it is not necessary to advert to the plethora of precedents on the subject because in *State of Uttaranchal v. Balwant Singh Chaufal* (2010) 3 SCC 402, a two-Judge Bench discussed the development of law relating to public interest litigation and reiterated that before entertaining such petitions, the Court must feel satisfied that the petitioner has genuinely come forward to espouse public cause and his litigious venture is not guided by any ulterior motive or is not a publicity gimmick.

58. In paragraphs 96 to 104, the Bench discussed Phase-III of the public interest litigation in the context of transparency and probity in governance, referred to the judgments in *Vineet Narain v. Union of India* (1998) 1 SCC 226, *Centre for Public Interest Litigation v. Union of India* (2003) 7 SCC 532, *Rajiv Ranjan Singh "Lalan" (VIII) v. Union of India* (2006) 6 SCC 613, *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* (2007) 1 SCC 110, *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India* (2008) 1 SCC 407 and observed:

"These are some of the cases where the Supreme Court and the High Courts broadened the scope of public interest litigation and also entertained petitions to ensure that in governance of the State, there is transparency and no extraneous considerations are taken into consideration except the public interest. These cases regarding probity in governance or corruption in public life dealt with by the courts can be placed in the third phase of public interest litigation."

59. Reference also deserves to be made to the judgment of the three-Judge Bench in *Shivajirao Nilangekar Patil v. Dr. Mahesh Madhav Gosavi* (1987) 1 SCC 227 in which a new dimension was given to the power of the Superior Courts to make investigation into the issues of public importance even though the petitioner may have moved the Court for vindication of a private interest. In that case the High Court had entertained a writ petition filed by Assistant Medical Officer of K.E.M.

Hospital, Bombay questioning the assessment of answer sheets of the Post Graduate Medical Examinations held by the Bombay University in October 1985. He alleged malpractices in the evaluation of the answer sheets of the daughter of the appellant who, at the relevant time, was Chief Minister of the State. The learned Single Judge held that altering and tampering of the grade sheets was done by Dr. Rawal at the behest of the Chief Minister. The Division Bench affirmed the order of the learned Single Judge with some modification.

60. While rejecting the objection raised on behalf of the appellant that the writ petition filed by the respondent cannot be treated as a petition filed in public interest, this Court observed:

"The allegations made in the petition disclose a lamentable state of affairs in one of the premier universities of India. The petitioner might have moved in his private interest but enquiry into the conduct of the examiners of the Bombay University in one of the highest medical degrees was a matter of public interest. Such state of affairs having been brought to the notice of the Court, it was the duty of the Court to the public that the truth and the validity of the allegations made be inquired into. It was in furtherance of public interest that an enquiry into the state of affairs of public institution becomes necessary and private litigation assumes the character of public interest litigation and such an enquiry cannot be avoided if it is necessary and essential for the administration of justice." (emphasis supplied)

9. In the light of the pronouncements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, when we are inclined to dismiss the writ petition, for lack of supporting material facts, for the purpose of seeking relief of a prerogative writ of mandamus, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the same. He has also made an endorsement to that effect.

10. Permission is granted. Writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn. No leave is granted to file another writ petition on the same cause. No Costs. Consequently, the connected writ miscellaneous petition is closed.

(S.M.K., J.) (S.P., J.)

09.10.2018

Index: Yes.

Internet: Yes

Speaking/Non speaking

ars

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
State of Tamilnadu,
Department of Revenue,
Fort Saint George,
Chennai - 600 009.

2. The District Collector,
District Collectorate,
Coimbatore.

3. The Revenue Divisional Officer,

Coimbatore South Division,
Coimbatore.

4. The Tahsildar,
Sulur Taluk,
Coimbatore District.

5. The Village Administrative Officer,
31-Varapatty Village,
Varapatty, Sulur-Taluk,
Coimbatore District.

S.MANIKUMAR,J.
AND
SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J.

ars

WP.No.26693 of 2018
and WMP No.31065 of 2018

09.10.2018