

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 4042 of 2019

Maharashtra Suraksha Rakshak AghadiPetitioner
versus
Security Guards Board for Greater
Mumbai and Thane District and anr.Respondents

Ms. Ranjana Todankar, advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. M. S. Topkar, advocate for the respondent No.1.
M. Saif Dingankar along with Mr. Devashis Wani I/b. D. Y. Wani and Co.,
advocates for the respondent No.2.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
SMT. BHARATI H. DANGRE, JJ.**

DATE : 29th MARCH, 2019.

P. C. :

Mentioned for production. Taken up on production board in
view of urgency.

2. Heard learned counsel appearing for the respective parties.

3. The petition is filed for the following reliefs:

“(a) This Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue
order or direction directing the Respondent No.2 Bank
to engage the services of the registered security
guards allotted by the Respondent No.1 Board.

(b) This Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue
order or direction restraining the Respondent No.2
from engaging the security guards through the private
agency.”

3. The petitioner has approached this Court apprehending that the respondent No.2 will discontinue the services of security guards/members allotted by the respondent No.1 to the respondent No.2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that by discontinuing the services of the security guards allotted by the respondent No.1, respondent No.2 proposes to appoint security guards from private agency. The petitioner has relied upon a chart at page 21 in this regard.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent No.2 vehemently opposed the petition. He submitted that total 47 security guards allotted by the respondent No.1 are engaged by the respondent No.2 in its Thane and Mumbai Branches. He further submitted that, in pursuance of policy of rationalization, the respondent No.2 proposes to retain the services of only 12 security guards out of these 47 security guards, and the services of other security guards would be discontinued. He also submitted that the respondent No.2 would not engage the services of security guards from the private security agencies in its Thane or Mumbai Branch. He also disputed the chart at page 21 and made a statement that as of today, not a single security guard is employed by the respondent No.2 from private security agency. He further made a statement that in future

if additional security guards are required to be appointed, they will be appointed from the respondent No.1 only. Both the statements are accepted.

5. In the above circumstances, in our view, the petitioner and respondent No.1, cannot compel the respondent No.2 to continue all the security guards. The petition is without merit and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

[SMT. BHARATI H. DANGRE, J.]

[RANJIT MORE, J.]