

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.14329 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 31.05.2018

Naveen Sharma

... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

... Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA**

Present:- Mr. Naveen Sharma, petitioner in person.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

Petitioner who appears in person has filed the instant writ petition styled as Public Interest Litigation voicing serious reservations and apprehensions that a movie titled “3 Dev” scheduled for release on 01.06.2018 would hurt the sentiments of followers of Sanatan Dharam/Hindu religion.

We have perused the pleadings on record and heard the petitioner.

The averments made in the petition only reflect the personal perception of the petitioner with regard to depiction of Shri Brahma, Shri Vishnu and Shri Shiv Shankar.

No basis has been disclosed in the petition on the strength of which petitioner is claiming to be representing the public at large and the followers of Sanatan Dharam/Hindu religion.

Even otherwise the present petition is completely silent

as regards the credentials of the petitioner for maintaining the present petition in public interest.

The guidelines to entertain a petition under public interest have been laid down under the Maintainability of Public Interest Litigation Rules, 2010 (for short 'the 2010 Rules'). Clause 6 of the 2010 Rules would be relevant to the issue at hand and is reproduced hereunder:

“6. Ordinarily, the PIL may be entertained on any subject of vital public importance, such as:

(a) Bonded Labour matters.

(b) Neglected Children.

(c) Petitions from riot victims.

(d) Petitions complaining of harassment or torture of persons belonging Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other Backward Classes by the others or by the police.

(e) Petitions pertaining to environmental pollution, disturbance of ecological balance, forest and wild life.

(f) Petitioners complaining violation of human rights.”

It was obligatory for the petitioner to have disclosed in the petition the previous attempts made by the petitioner to espouse any public cause and the orders that may have been passed by the Court in such proceedings.

No details in such regard are forthcoming.

We are of the considered view that the present petition is not maintainable in public interest at the hands of the petitioner.

Petition dismissed.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

31.05.2018

vandana

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No