

(1)

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

910 WRIT PETITION NO.8450 OF 2020

**AASARAM GANGADHAR SHELKE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS**

...
Mr S. R. Yadav-Lonikar, A.G.P. for respondents/State

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
AND
S. G. MEHARE, JJ.**

DATE : 30th June, 2021

PER COURT:

1. This petition has been preferred by the petitioner putting forth prayer clauses (B), (C) and (D) as under :

“B) Issue writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of writ of mandamus, thereby directing the respondent No.2, 3 & 4 to take prompt and effective steps for restart of the road work, by taking necessary steps for completion of road distance 3.150km from NH211 to Sekhapur to Ta. Sarhad, taluka Khultabad, district Aurangabad as per provisions MMGSY, within stipulated time frame and for that purpose issue necessary orders.

C) Issue writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of writ of mandamus, directing respondent No.1 to conduct the discrete enquiry

(2)

into the illegalities committed by respondent No.2, 3 and 4 regarding uncompleted road work sectioned under MMGSY from NH211 to Sekhapur to Ta. Sarhad, Ta. Khultabad, Dist Aurangabad and further to take necessary action against the erring officers and for that purpose issue necessary orders.

D) Issue writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of writ of mandamus, thereby directing the respondent No.2, 3 & 4 to take prompt and effective steps for sectioning remaining all weather road work under MMGSY about distance 1.5 km under MMGSY between village Mategaon Taluka Kannad District Aurangabad To NH211 and for that purpose issue necessary orders.”

2. In the entire petition, the petitioner has not stated as to what is the legal injury caused to him for which he has filed this petition. It appears that this petition may have a semblance of a Public Interest Litigation.

3. On 23/06/2021, we had passed the following order :

“1. None present for the petitioner either online or in the Court hall in which an arrangement to address this Court through video conferencing has been made.

2. Stand over to 28th June 2021 for passing orders.”

(3)

4. Again on 28/06/2021, we had passed the following order :-

“1. On 23.06.2021, none appeared for the petitioner through the online mode or by appearing in the Court hall in which an arrangement to address the Court through video conferencing has been made. We, therefore, posted the matter today for passing orders. Even at the second call today, none appears for the petitioner.

2. As such, list this petition on 30th June 2021 for passing orders of dismissal.”

5. Even today, the petitioner is not present through the online mode or in the Court Hall in which an arrangement for addressing the Court through video conferencing has been made.

6. In view of the above, this petition stands dismissed in default. Needless to state, if the petitioner moves an application for restoration of the petition, he shall first establish his bona fides in filing this petition.

(S. G. MEHARE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

sjk