

Shivgan

SHAMBHAVI  
NILESH  
SHIVGAN  
Digitally  
signed by  
SHAMBHAVI  
NILESH  
SHIVGAN  
Date:  
2023.02.15  
11:48:07  
+0530

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**  
**WRIT PETITION NO.9947 OF 2014**

Premchand Shivnath Bagoria ...Petitioner  
*Versus*  
The State of Maharashtra & Ors ...Respondents

**Mr Ramsuresh Vishvakarma , for the Petitioner.**  
**Mrs AA Purav, AGP for the Respondent-State.**

**CORAM G.S. Patel &**  
**Neela Gokhale, JJ.**  
**DATED: 13th February 2023**

**PC:-**

1. The Petition is misconceived. The Petitioner insists that he is entitled to the information set out at Page 33. The request is as vague as it can be in relation to Item (1). The Petitioner complains of harassment by “some anti-social elements”. These persons are not named. The demand in Item 1 is for “a copy of the statement given by ‘them’.” This RTI query was addressed to the police. To our question, asked at least five times, what that ‘statement’ supposed to refer to, we received no answer. Our question to the learned Advocate of the Petitioner was to identify his NC complaint or FIR Number, on which, he claims, a statement was recorded. He could not tell us.

2. Instead, we were shown a letter dated 5th June 2008 at page 29 and were expected to believe that on this letter some statement was recorded. The Petitioner would have it that the police will, on some correspondence, launch investigations and record statements. There is no NC. There is no FIR. And yet there is this demand.

3. The next query is evidently a roving enquiry asking how many NC complaints and cases are registered against a third party, one Prakash Chawla, who is not even joined as party respondent to the Petition. Even worse, the query is in regard to complaints and cases registered against Chawla “and his family” and copies are demanded. It is not shown how the Petitioner is in any way connected with this.

4. Then there is in Item (3), a copy of an NC complaint said to be registered by one Sanjay Tukaram Lokhande, also not joined to this Petition, against the Petitioner “after 1st June 2008”. Even this is incomprehensible. If there was such a complaint and it was investigated, undoubtedly the Petitioner would have been contacted by the police.

5. There are two Affidavits in Reply. These show that the Petitioner has been given inspection and copies. The Petitioner says that the statements made by Senior Officers of the Police on affidavit in this Court are false. He claims that no inspection was given to him. This is contrary to the record that is before this Court. The Affidavits have annexed to them documents from pages 85 to 87

establishing that such inspection was actually given. This is a contemporaneous record. We see no reason to disbelieve it.

6. We are wholly unable to understand what, beyond a bruised ego, is the Petitioner's actual grievance. It is unclear what his legal right or entitlement is. Item 1 of the query is based on speculation. Item 2 is a roving enquiry. Item 3 is again in the realm of speculation.

7. There is no substance in the Petition. The Petition is rejected.

**( Neela Gokhale, J)**

**(G. S. Patel, J)**