

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 51/2019.

Swabhimani Setkari Sanghatna

-VERSUS-

Union of India and others.

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders

Sau. Priyanka R. Arbat, Advocate for Petitioner.
Shri U. Aurangabadkar, A.S.G.I. for Respondent Nos. 1 & 2.
Shri A.M. Deshpande, Addl.G.P. for Respondent No. 5.

CORAM : R.K. DESHPANDE &
VINAY JOSHI, JJ.

DATE : SEPTEMBER 11, 2019.

Heard.

2. Our attention is invited to paragraph no.6 of the petition, which seeks implementation of the Scheme called "Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojna (PMFBY)" launched on 14.01.2016, by the Prime Minister of India. It is urged that about 2422 farmers are affected, as there is a failure on the part of respondents to implement the scheme to extend the benefits to such farmers. It is further urged that the amount of premium is also paid by the agriculturists,

2

but, they are deprived of the benefits under the Scheme by certain private insurance companies namely - Agriculture Insurance Company, Bajaj Allianz General Insurance Company Ltd., ICICI Lombard General Insurance Co. Ltd., IFCO TOKIO General Insurance Co. Ltd. etc.

3. The Maharashtra Legal Services Authority conducts camps at various places to see that the schemes floated by the Central or State Government are implemented, and the benefits available thereunder should reach to the eligible persons. For this purpose periodical camps are held at certain places.

4. We find that the grievance raised in this Public Interest Litigation is an individual grievance and no general directions can be issued by this Court. The eligible persons who are deprived of the benefits under the aforesaid Scheme, can put up their grievance during the course of the camps at such places and even in absence of such camps, they can approach the District Legal Services Authority with their grievance for being redressed. Thereafter, such individual can file a petition also if the grievance is not redressed.

3

5. We therefore, do not find any reason to entertain this petition. The same is dismissed with liberty to adopt such course of action, as may be available in law to the individuals. No costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Rgd.