

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 117 OF 2019

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 753 OF 2012

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 753 OF 2012

Stri Shakti Kendra and Ors.	}	Petitioners
versus		
Union of India and Ors.	}	Respondents

Mr.Arif Doctor with Mr.Kalpesh Joshi and
Ms.Nisha Shah i/b. M/s.Kalpesh Joshi and
Associates for the petitioners/applicants.

Mr.G.Hariharan i/b. Mr.Gul Ansari for
respondent no.1.

Mr.S.B.Gore-AGP for State.

Dr.Birendra Saraf with Ms.Shoma Maitra
and Mr.Nikhil Apte i/b. M/s.Wadia Ghandy
and Co for respondent no.10.

CORAM :- S. C. DHARMADHIKARI &
G. S. PATEL, JJ.

DATED :- JUNE 12, 2019

P.C. :-

1. Heard both sides.
2. So long as there is a facility and a counter so also parking lot provided so as to enable the passengers arriving at the domestic and international airport to book prepaid taxis,

particularly those operated by women and under the auspices of the applicant before us, we do not think that in writ jurisdiction we can ensure a regular flow of passengers towards the applicants nor can we probe into the grievances and complaint made on their behalf by Mr.Doctor that the officers of the Mumbai International Airport Limited are not directing their employees or agents to divert the passengers' traffic towards the applicants or apprising them about the facility made available by the applicants. Such grievances, if result in financial loss, can be a subject matter of distinct legal proceedings. It is not the grievance of the applicants that no facility has been made available or there is no counter which gives information to the arriving public that such taxis, operated exclusively by women, are parked outside the terminal.

3. We do not think that in writ jurisdiction all such matters should be looked into any further. Eventually, these are matters of policies and policies may undergo change or modification from time to time. If the grievances are that these ideal are not framed or better policies could have been devised, then, they should be raised before the concerned statutory authorities. Writ jurisdiction is not an appropriate remedy.

4. The writ petition and the notice motion both are dismissed.
There would be no order as to costs.

(G.S.PATEL, J.)

(S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)