

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (STAMP) NO.10589 OF 2020

**SAYYED TAUSEEF YASEEN
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS**

...
Shri Muhammad Aseem, Advocate for the petitioner.
Shri D.R.Kale, Government Pleader, for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.

...

CORAM: RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.

DATE :- 12th May, 2020

Per Court:

1 This matter is taken up through Video Conferencing by Vidyo App during the nationwide lock-down on account of COVID-19 pandemic.

2 The learned advocate for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader have been heard at length. I have perused the grounds raised in the petition and have also considered the prayer clauses.

3 The short issue raised by the petitioner is that the residents of district Beed are apprehensive, in the light of the order issued by the District Collector, Beed dated 09.05.2020, that they would not be able to buy their essentials/ daily required grocery, if they are unable to download the NEEDLY APP (Home Delivery App) and they further apprehend that the District Collector has directed the closing of all shops including the Kirana shops and those catering to daily needs and

requirements of the public at large.

4 The learned Government Pleader has brought to my notice the text below item 2 of the order passed by the District Collector, Beed dated 09.05.2020. I find that there is no dispute that the residents of the concerned 11 talukas are at liberty to contact their regular suppliers through Whatsapp/ phone calls/ sms, if they are unable to use the NEEDLY APP and as such, they can place orders for their daily needs and for purchasing their necessities. It is also set out that the shops would be physically opened on even dates between 07:00 AM to 09:30 AM and the residents, who desire to purchase their daily needs, can visit such shops and by following discipline of social distancing, can physically make purchases. It is also provided that the shops could be kept open from 07:00 AM to 2:00 PM on even dates if there are no curfew orders in the concerned localities.

5 I find that the apprehension of the petitioner is put to rest in view of the above.

6 The petitioner, who is a practicing advocate in the Bombay High Court, Bench at Aurangabad and presently residing at Beed, is satisfied and seeks leave to withdraw this petition.

7 As such, this Public Interest Litigation is disposed off.