

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO.103 OF 2022

Prashant Trivedi

....Petitioner

V/S

Union of India & Ors.

....Respondents

...

Mr. Prashant Trivedi – Petitioner in person.

Ms. Anubha Rastogi a/w Ms. Shikha Nambia for Respondent No.2.

Ms. Meenu, SEBI Officer present in Court.

...

**CORAM: S.V. GANGAPURWALA, ACJ &
SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.**

DATE : 18 JANUARY 2023.

P.C.:

1 We have heard the learned Advocate for the Petitioner and the learned Advocate for the Respondent No.2.

2 The Petitioner seeks directions against the Respondents to mention in their each show cause notice/summon/order about the right of legal representation available to the noticees, if they want to avail the legal aid. So also seeks directions against the Respondents to appoint and maintain a panel/list of lawyers, whose services can be availed for such legal aid.

3 The Affidavit is filed by Respondent No.2 to the effect that the SEBI and IPEF Regulations and Guidelines in respect of legal aid for legal proceedings are in force since the year 2009 and whenever the need arises the legal aid is provided.

4 Before filing the present PIL, the Petitioner has not approached Maharashtra State Legal Services Authority and/or the responsible Authority and has straightway filed the present PIL.

5 The PIL cannot be entertained unless the Authorities concerned have denied to entertain the cause of the Petitioner.

6 On record we do not find that a particular person had approached Respondent No.2 for legal aid and was denied. In absence of specific pleadings in that regard, it would not be appropriate to pass orders in the present PIL.

7 In case, in future, the Petitioner approaches the Authorities/Bodies concerned and his grievance is not redressed then the Petitioner may agitate about the rights.

8 The PIL is disposed of. No costs.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

(ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)