

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO. 802 OF 2019

DIANA DE SOUZA.,

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THR. ITS CHIEF
SECRETARY AND 5 ORS.,

... Respondents

Mr. Vibhav Rajiv Amonkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Prashil Arolkar, Advocate for Respondents No. 1, 3, 5 and 6.

Ms. Kalpa D. Govenkar, Advocate holding for Mr. Ashwin D.
Bhobe, Advocate for Respondent No. 2.

Coram:- M. S. SONAK &
NUTAN D. SARDESSAI, JJ.

Date:- 16th October, 2019

P.C.

Heard Mr. Amonkar, learned Counsel for the Petitioner.

2. According to us, this Petition is not required to be entertained simply because it is directed against one or two persons who are sitting with their small boxes to polish shoes of the commuters. This cannot be styled as some encroachment on footpath as sought to be made out in this Petition.

3. Accordingly, this Petition is dismissed.

4. At this stage, learned Counsel for the Petitioner points out that the Petitioner had filed Writ Petition No. 458 of 2019 which was disposed of by this Court by order dated 08.07.2019. On the perusal of the order it is seen that the Petitioner had made it clear that her grievance stands fully redressed by the action of the Municipal Inspector. In that Petition also, the Petitioner alleged that there were illegal encroachments on the public footpath outside her shop. Now in this Petition, the Petitioner has annexed photographs from which it is clear that there are no encroachments as such on the footpath outside the Petitioner's shop. This means that the Petitioner is accustomed to filing frivolous petitions. Accordingly, this Petition is dismissed with cost nominally quantified at Rs.100/- on account of the persuasion of the learned Counsel for the Petitioner.

NUTAN D. SARDESSAI, J.

M. S. SONAK, J.

msr