

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
APPELLATE SIDE

WRIT PETITION NO. 14431 OF 2022

Mukesh Vijay Tharali. ... Petitioner.  
V/s.  
High Court of Judicature of Bombay  
through Registrar-II (Vigilance) and others. ... Respondents.

Mr.Kaushal A. Tamhane i/b. Dhanuka & Partners  
for the Petitioner.  
Ms.Dhruti Datar i/b. Mr.R.S.Datar for Respondent No.1.  
Mr.B.V.Samant, AGP for Respondent No.3.

SANJAY  
KASHINATH  
NANOSKAR

Digitally signed by  
SANJAY KASHINATH  
NANOSKAR

Date: 2023.08.10  
11:30:58 +0530

**CORAM :**                      **NITIN JAMDAR, AND  
SANDEEP V. MARNE, JJ.**

**DATE :**                      **4 August 2023.**

**P.C. :**

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2.                      The Petitioner had filed complaint on the administrative side against the Respondent No.2- judicial officer, which complaint has been closed after due consideration by the Administration. The fact that the complaint has been closed is informed to the Petitioner. By this petition, the Petitioner is seeking direction to Respondent No.1 to issue a certified copy of the order of Appropriate Authority as mentioned in the communication issued to the Petitioner.

3. The learned counsel for the Petitioner has not shown us any pre-existing legal right, or any Rule or any judicial precedent for getting such a certified copy. The learned counsel for the Petitioner states that it is under extra ordinary powers of this Court that the Court may direct to give copy of the order. The learned counsel states that the fundamental rights of the Petitioner are affected. The Respondent No.1 has filed reply opposing the petition.

4. The learned counsel is not able to show as to in what manner the fundamental rights are affected. The Petitioner had brought to the notice to the administrative side of this Court which according to the Petitioner, was a misconduct of the judicial officer. It has been looked into and a decision is taken. By filing complaint and bringing the conduct to the notice on the administrative side of this Court, the Petitioner cannot be said to have assumed status akin to a litigant qua the Respondent No.1. A decision is taken as to the allegations made and the decision is informed to the Petitioner. No writ of mandamus can be issued as sought for.

5. In view of this position, writ petition is rejected.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

(NITIN JAMDAR, J.)