

Ashwini

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 170 OF 2019
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 545 OF 1995
WITH
IN PERSON APPLICATION NO. 22 OF 2020
IN
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 170 OF 2019

Unnikrishnan K Panickar ...Petitioner
Versus
The Union of India & Ors ...Respondents

Mr Unnikrishnan Panickar, *Petitioner in person, is present.*
Ms Sukanta Karmakar, AGP, *for the Respondent-State.*

CORAM G.S. Patel &
Vinay Joshi, JJ.
DATED: 11th March 2022

ASHWINI
HULGOJI
GAJAKOSH

Digitally signed
by ASHWINI
HULGOJI
GAJAKOSH
Date: 2022.03.14
10:34:54 +0530

PC:-

1. The matter is thoroughly misconceived. The main Writ Petition 545 of 1995 was disposed of on merits by an order of 20th October 1996. The Petition was dismissed. The Petitioner was directed to seek appropriate reliefs in a pending Suit. That Writ Petition sought the issuance of identity cards to the Petitioners and members of Lohia Nagar.

2. After that the present Motion is filed. To this Motion, there are 115 Respondents. Every conceivable authority from a lady

constable, on duty clerk or duty officer, two police officers and officers of our Registry are joined. More importantly, we find that in this thoroughly irresponsible Writ Petition we have the names of four former Chief Ministers, Presidents of political parties from Maharashtra to the Centre and, so that there is no conceivable omission, Advocates of this Court by name. But it gets worse. We then have arrayed as Respondents at least one Retired Judge of the Supreme Court and a former Judge of this Court, a former Chief Justice of this Court, a former Judge of this Court and even a sitting Judge of this Court. All of this is purportedly in aid of a desired set of reliefs that are incomprehensible and run from clause (a) to clause (y). There is a supporting Affidavit (which the Petitioner seems to have self numbered).

3. Apart from anything else, the Petitioner does not have leave to appear in person. There is an In Person Application No. 22 of 2020 for leave to appear in person. We withdraw that Application to ourselves. On the face of it, and given the manner in which this Petitioner has filed proceedings that are clearly vexatious and mischievous and since we find that he is a constant source of disturbance to the Court, we reject the In Person Application.

4. We also dismiss the Notice of Motion. There will be no order as to costs.

(Vinay Joshi, J)

(G. S. Patel, J)