

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA**CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 30 OF 2019****IN****WRIT PETITION NO. 1175 OF 2016**

TRAVEL AND TOURISM ASSOCIATION OF
GOA (TTAG), THR. ITS PRESIDENT
SAVIO MESSIAS AND ANR.

... Petitioners

Versus

RAJAN SATARDEKAR.

... Respondent

Mr. N. Sardesai, Senior Advocate with Mr. Gaurang D. Panandiker,
Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. D. Pangam, Advocate General with Ms. M. Correia, Addl.
Government Advocate for the Respondent.

Mr. Suren Uppal and Ms. S. Baul, Advocates for the Applicant in MCA
No.970 of 2019.

Coram:- M. S. SONAK &

SMT. M. S. JAWALKAR, JJ.

Date:- 20th January, 2020

P.C.

Heard Mr. N. Sardesai, learned Senior Advocate alongwith
Mr. G. Panandiker for the Petitioners and Mr. D. Pangam, learned
Advocate General alongwith Ms. M. Correia, learned Addl. Government
Advocate for the State.

2. Though, not necessary, we have also heard Mr. S. Uppal, learned counsel appearing for Rosmerta Autotech Pvt. Ltd., who has taken out Misc. Civil Application No.970 of 2019 in Writ Petition No.1175 of 2016 which also relates to the installation of digital meters in the taxis.

3. In this matter, on 15th October, 2019, we made the following order :-

“Prima facie, we are satisfied that the Respondent is in contempt of this Court. There are clear directions in our order dated 05.07.2019, which orders were in fact made on the basis of the statement made on behalf of the Respondent in the matter of implementation of Automated Tracking Device with integrated emergency system and Fare Meter in passenger taxis.

2. The project was to be implemented from 01.08.2019 on regular basis.

3. Today, the Respondent Contemnor has filed an application seeking extension of time. This application was filed on 14.08.2019, i.e. way beyond the date by which the project was to be implemented. The application seeks extension of time by two months, which period, would expire by 1st October 2019. Till today, there does not appear to be any progress in the matter of implementation of the scheme.

4. Accordingly, issue notice to the Respondent returnable on 22.10.2019. On this date, the Respondent to file affidavit to show cause as to why action under Contempt of Court Act should not be initiated against him.

5. Registry to ensure that the notice is served upon the

Respondent expeditiously.

6. Stand over to 22.10.2019.”

4. Thereafter, the learned Advocate General on 14th November, 2019, made a statement that in all probabilities by 4th December, 2019, the scheme for installation of digital meters in the taxis on pilot basis will commence. In the latter order made on 5th December, 2019, the learned Advocate General clarified that the scheme, on pilot basis had in fact commenced from 26th November, 2019 itself and was being continued. He pointed out that no sooner the implementation, in all respects, on pilot basis is successful and teething issues are sorted out, the steps will be taken to implement the scheme on regular basis. On that date, he submitted that it may not be possible to make a definite statement as to the timeline. However, he assured this Court that some statement regards the timeline will be made on the next date. Accordingly, the matter was adjourned to 20th January, 2020 i.e. today.

5. Today, the learned Advocate General makes a statement that the implementation of the scheme of installation of digital meters in taxis on pilot basis has been successful. He also makes a statement that Notification regards the fare rates will be issued by the State Government within a period of 15 days from today. He states that no sooner this Notification is issued, the installation of digital meters in taxis will commence.

6. The learned Advocate General states that Rosmerta Autotech Pvt. Ltd. (RAPL) is the agency which will have to install these meters in taxis no sooner the fare Notification is issued.

7. Mr. Uppal, learned counsel appearing for RAPL on instructions states that the process of installation of digital meters in taxis will commence within a period of one week from the date of issuance of fare Notification. This statement is also accepted. He states that once the installation process is commenced, the same will be followed up expeditiously and will conclude in maximum period of six months. This is in terms of our order dated 5th July, 2019 in Writ Petition No.1175 of 2016, of which the contempt is alleged in this petition.

8. We accept all the aforesaid statements as the statements made to this Court. In view of the same, we see no good ground to continue with this contempt petition any further.

9. The Contempt Petition is accordingly disposed of.

SMT. M. S. JAWALKAR, J.

M. S. SONAK, J.

at*