

pdp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION STAMP NO. 20931 OF
2018

Savita Pravin Torane – Ragade

..Petitioner

Vs.

The Ulhasnagar Municipal Corporation
and Ors.

..Respondents

Mr. Sangharaj D. Rupawate, Mr. Milind A. Ingole, Mr. Manoj P.
Jadhav I/by Bhujang More for petitioner.

Ms. Pooja P. Joshi for respondent Nos.1 to 3.

Mr. M. M. Pabale, AGP for respondent No.4.

CORAM: PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, CJ. &
N. M. JAMDAR, J.

APRIL 26, 2019.

P.C.

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. The grievance in the Public Interest Petition is to the slow pace at which a bridge was being constructed by the contractor. It is pleaded that on account of the time period fixed to construct the bridge expiring, extending the same, the project cost was increased. Another grievance made is to award the work to the same contractor for extra work without inviting e-tenders.

3. The bridge in question has concededly been completed.

4. What occasioned the delay for construction of the bridge has not been pleaded in the petition. We find that the petitioner is a Corporator in the Municipal Corporation of the Ulhasnagar Municipal Corporation and as a Corporator she could have easily got the relevant record from the Corporation to show what occasioned the delay in construction of the bridge. On the issue of extra work being awarded to the same contractor, there are not pleadings as to what was the nature of the extra work. More often than not, the work of completion of a bridge requires ancillary work in the nature of slip-road etc. We are not inclined to go into the issue of extra works in the absence of pleadings in the petition.

5. The petition is disposed of on account of the fact that the relief pertaining to the bridge being constructed has become infructuous for the reason the bridge has been constructed. Other issues raised are vague in nature.

N. M. JAMDAR, J.

CHIEF JUSTICE