

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO. 1027 OF 2019

THE MANAGING COMMITTEE OF SHRI
DEVI MAYA KELBAI DEVSTHAN, MAYEM,
THR. ITS ATT., PRAVIN PARAB.

... Petitioner

Versus

MAMLATDAR AND ADMINISTRATOR OF
DEVALAYAS OF BICHOLIM, TALUKA AND
ANR.

... Respondents

Mr. Ashwin D. Bhobe, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. D. Pangam, Advocate General with Ms. A. Kamat, Addl.
Government Advocate for Respondent No.1.

Mr. P. Talaulikar, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

**Coram:- M. S. SONAK &
SMT. M. S. JAWALKAR, JJ.**

Date:- 27th January, 2020

P.C.

Heard Mr. Bhobe, learned counsel for the Petitioner, Mr. D.
Pangam, learned Advocate General for Respondent No.1 and Mr.
Talaulikar, learned counsel for Respondent No.2.

2. The challenge in this petition is to the judgment and order
dated 28th September, 2019 made by the Respondent No.1. The
operative portion of the impugned order reads as follows :-

"The Religious Ceremony of Ghatasthapana in Maya Kelbai Devasthan, Mayem, is directed to be performed as per the religious rituals and as per the custom of the said Devasthan which is carried out for last several years. The Devasthan is directed to perform the religious ceremony in a traditional manner which is as per the custom of the said devasthan/temple.

The Police Inspector, Bicholim is hereby directed to depute Armed Police Personnel on the said site to maintain law and order."

3. Admittedly, the religious ceremony which is referred to in the impugned order has already taken place. The only grievance of the Petitioner is that the impugned order was issued on the eve of the ceremony and even the copies thereof were furnished after the conclusion of the ceremony thereby denying the Petitioner access to justice.

4. In the present case, since the religious ceremony is already concluded and since, we propose to clarify that the observations in the impugned order are not really determinative of *inter se* rights of any parties, we feel that no useful purpose will be served by entertaining the present petition at this stage.

5. Accordingly, by clarifying that the observations in the impugned order are not determinative of rights, if any, of the respective parties, we dispose of the present petition.

6. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, there shall be no order as to costs.

SMT. M. S. JAWALKAR, J.

M. S. SONAK, J.

at*