

Mr.Satish Sakharam Agashe	}	Petitioner
versus		
State of Maharashtra and Ors.	}	Respondents

Mr.B.V.Samant-AGP for State.

DATED :- NOVEMBER 6, 2019

1. Having heard the learned advocate appearing for the petitioner and perusing the PIL and the annexures thereto, we do not think that in our limited jurisdiction we can direct making or framing of any scheme, particularly concerning water supply. If drinking water supply is not as per the demand of the people residing in the locality or the needs of the increasing population, it is not as if in writ jurisdiction we can direct framing of schemes. That is a complex process. Merely because some schemes are framed, steps are taken, but there is no end to the problems of the residents in the locality, we do not think that in writ jurisdiction this court can pass mandatory order and directions of the nature prayed in this PIL petition.

2. With the aforesaid observations, the public interest litigation is dismissed.

(R.I.CHAGLA, J.)

(S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)