

Shephali

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 8806 OF 2021**

Ranvir Kehar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra, Secretary Sports &
Youth Services Department & Ors

...Respondents

Mr Satyajeet Anil Rajeshirke, for the Petitioner.

Mr KS Thorat, AGP, for Respondent No. 1-State.

Mr Rohaan Savant, i/b A & P Partners, for Respondent No. 2.

Mr Devendranath S Joshi, for Respondent No. 3.

**CORAM G.S. Patel &
 Madhav J. Jamdar, JJ.**

DATED: 10th December 2021

PC:-

SHEPHALI
SANJAY
MORMARE

Digitally signed
by SHEPHALI
SANJAY
MORMARE
Date: 2021.12.10
18:03:31 +0530

1. The Petition is not maintainable at the instance of this Petitioner. Paragraph 20 of the Petition says that the Petitioner has filed this Writ Petition “in the interest of local players” and he has done so “after receiving oral instructions” from various district units. None of the allegedly aggrieved players who have been left out from the selection process has come before the court. In fact, across the Bar this is confirmed and we are told that no aggrieved player is willing to come forward.

2. The Petitioner claims to be the General Secretary of “The Hockey Maharashtra”. This is a seriously contested claim. Mr Sawant for the 2nd Respondent, also called “The Hockey Maharashtra”, points out that this very claim made by the Petitioner has twice not been accepted by this Court by Division Bench orders made on 21st November 2015 and 5th December 2015.

3. The Petitioner also claims to represent certain district units. But this takes us back to the first point that none of the players in those districts have complained of being left out from the selection process. We do not know from this Petition, if indeed there are players from these very districts who have already been selected.

4. The principal grievance seems to be that certain hockey players, whom the Petitioner describes as “professionals” and who are employed by various public sector undertakings, have also been chosen. This is immaterial to the question of alleged exclusion. That question of being excluded can only be advanced by a person who is aggrieved, i.e., one who has been excluded from consideration in a Writ Petition.

5. Alternatively, there must be a properly framed PIL if the cause that is being espoused is not of a personal interest but is on behalf of others.

6. The present Petition is some sort of hybrid. It is not filed as a PIL, and yet the Petitioner claims to represent a large, unidentified

and unnamed body of allegedly aggrieved persons. There is no authority letter and not a single complaint is shown to us.

7. We find against the Petitioner on locus. We also find no merit in the Writ Petition, which is predicated on conjecture, surmise and unproved oral information. The Petition is rejected. There will be no order as to costs.

8. Any disputes between the Petitioner association and the 2nd Respondent, and which are been before any apex authority will be unaffected by this order.

9. Vakalatnamas on behalf of the Respondents who appear today will be filed in one week.

10. All concerned will act on production of a digitally signed copy of this order.

(Madhav J. Jamdar, J)

(G. S. Patel, J)