

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 3 OF 2020

Babaso Maruti Dighe

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra through Secretary
and Ors.

... Respondents

Mr. Niketan Nakhawa for the petitioner.

Mr. P.P. Kakade, GP a/w Mr. M.M. Pabale, AGP for the respondent
nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9.

CORAM : B.P. DHARMADHIKARI,
ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE &
NITIN R. BORKAR, J.
DATE : MARCH 13, 2020

P.C.:

Heard for some time.

2. Effort is to urge that the duplicate copy for transporter has been used and for the same quantity double payment has been claimed and accepted. Though the petitioner avers this, in the representation made to the Authorities there is no such specific assertion. Vague and general words are used claiming that there is misappropriation. It appears that because of such complaint one of the authorities had also earlier found it necessary to hold an enquiry. However, in the present jurisdiction, we find the

material insufficient to issue any direction.

3. We grant the petitioner leave to make specific and detailed representation in this respect. If his grievance is not redressed thereafter, we grant him leave to approach this court again. Thus keeping all the contentions of the parties open and with the above observations, we dispose of the present PIL.

NITIN R. BORKAR, J.

ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE