

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

WRIT PETITION No. 1067 OF 2022.

Partha Sarathy Sarkar. Petitioner.

VERSUS

R.N. Joshi, Registrar-I (Vigilance)
High Court (A.S.) Bombay and others. Respondents.

Mr.P.S. Sarkar – Petitioner - in-person.
Mr.M.M. Awode, Advocate h/f. Mr.F.T. Mjirza,
Advocate for Respondent No.1.

**CORAM : NITIN JAMDAR AND
ANIL L. PANSARE, JJ.**

DATE : 11 MARCH 2022.

P.C.

Heard the Petitioner – Inperson.

2. The Petitioner who is an Advocate, is aggrieved by the communication issued by the Registrar (Vigilance) High Court to him stating that no further correspondence on the subject would be

2

entertained in future.

3. This communication was issued because the Petitioner had sought permission to prosecute a Judicial Officer and the Government of Maharashtra had issued an order rejecting the permission to prosecute. It is this order of the Government of Maharashtra was communicated to the Petitioner by the impugned communication.

4. The Petitioner states that he is aggrieved by the tenor of the impugned communication, which is terse, whereby it is stated that no complaint would be entertained in future and he submits that such remark is also contrary to law. The Petitioner states that if so advised, he would take necessary steps in respect of the order passed by the Government of Maharashtra.

5. Though we understand that the Petitioner is aggrieved by the tenor of the letter, what the Registrar has sought to communicate is that since the Government of Maharashtra has rejected the permission to prosecute, nothing further the Registrar could do. Therefore, though this communication could have been phrased in better manner as sought by the Petitioner, the fact is that as long as the order of the Government of Maharashtra stands, the Registrar would not be able to entertain further correspondence.

6. With these observations, the Writ Petition is disposed of.

(ANIL L. PANSARE, J) (NITIN JAMDAR, J)

Rgd