

JPP

***IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 34 OF 2015***

Smita Ramesh Gaikwad

... Petitioner

V/s.

Baguram Kadam and Associates and Ors.

... Respondents.

Ms. Smita Ramesh Gaikwad, Petitioner-in-person.

Mr. Sandip J. Ghogare for Respondent No.1.

Ms. P.H. Kantharia, Govt. Pleader for the Respondent 2 - State.

Mr. H.C. Pimple for Respondent No.3 – MCGM.

***CORAM : PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, C.J. &
N.M. JAMDAR, J.***

DATE : 26 APRIL 2019.

P.C. :-

We have heard the Petitioner, and have perused the Petition. The Petition is vague and without any structure. It does not even have proper prayers. Be that as it may, the Petitioner's main grievance appears to be against Respondent – Trust. The Petitioner has initiated proceedings before the Charity Authorities against the

Respondent-Trust. The Petitioner can always proceed against the Respondent-Trust before the appropriate authorities as per law. The inter-se dispute between the Petitioner and Respondent-Trust does not raise any question of public importance.

2. The Petitioner has asserted that there is a temple worthy of national heritage on the land of Respondent – Trust. The Respondent -Trust, in the reply, has asserted that it has no intention of demolishing the temple. The Archaeological authorities have stated that they could not find any traces to indicate that the temple was ancient and a national heritage. We have no reason to disbelieve this conclusion.

3. In the circumstances, no orders are required to be passed. The Petition is disposed of.

N.M. JAMDAR, J.

CHIEF JUSTICE