

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

**PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO.35 OF 2018
WITH
CHAMBER SUMMONS NO.113 OF 2019**

Dipak Kumar Chattopadhyay ..Petitioner
Versus
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ..Respondents

Mr. Brijesh Upadhyay i/by Utsav Ghosh, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Abhay Patki, Addl. Govt. Pleader for Respondent No.1 – State.

Mr. Rui A. Rodrigues, Advocate for University of Mumbai.

Mr. Jamshed Mistry a/w Mr. Gaurav Jangle i/by I. V. Merchant & Co., Advocate for Applicant IN CHSW No.113 of 2019.

Mr. P. M. Palshikar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 to 5.
Mr. Amit Sale, Advocate for Respondent No.6.

**CORAM : PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, C.J. &
SMT. BHARATI DANGRE, J.**

DATE : 4th OCTOBER, 2019

P.C.

1] Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2] The challenge is to circular dated 18th May 2018 issued by Director, Examination and Valuation Committee of University of Mumbai requiring that

henceforth question papers of law students would be evaluated at the respective college affiliated to the University but as per the questions set by the University. The Petitioner states that the said circular is illegal.

3] In what manner the circular is illegal has not been pleaded in the Petition. Counsel for the Petitioner concedes to said fact. However, counsel places reliance upon the Advocates Act, 1961 and reference to Section 7 thereof.

4] We do not find anything contained in Section 7 which has a bearing on who would evaluate. At this stage, counsel for the Petitioner under instructions of the Petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the PIL.

5] The PIL is dismissed as not pressed.

6] All pending applications are disposed of as infructuous.

SMT. BHARATI DANGRE, J

CHIEF JUSTICE