

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE

WRIT PETITION NO. 8614 OF 2018

Mr.Sandeep Bhaskar Naik. ... Petitioner.
V/s.
Indian Express Private Limited and another. ... Respondents.

None for the Petitioner.

Dr.Abhinav Chandrachud with Mr.Amol Joshi, Mr.Pranit Kulkarni,
Ms.Tejasvi Ghag i/b. Ms.Poorvi Kamani for the Respondents.

SANJAY
KASHINATH
NANOSKAR

CORAM : NITIN JAMDAR, AND
M.M. SATHAYE, JJ.

DATE : 20 March 2024.

Digitally signed by
SANJAY
KASHINATH
NANOSKAR
Date: 2024.03.27
12:09:59 +0530

P.C. :

On 13 March 2024, the following order came to be
passed:

*“ A request is made on behalf of the counsel for the
Petitioner for adjournment. The learned counsel for the
Respondents points out that the relief sought for has already
been adjudicated upon in various proceedings. The prayer in
the petition is to set aside the order passed by this Court.*

*2. Prima facie, the petition is misconceived.
However, out of indulgence, stand over to Monday i.e. 18
March 2024. To be listed under the caption “For Dismissal”.*

The petition is accordingly listed under the caption “For Dismissal”. The board is notified in advance. Yet, none appears for the Petitioner.

2. The Petitioner was employed with the Respondent establishment in the year 1989. He was terminated from service on 8 August 1991. The Petitioner filed complaint before in the Labour Curt, Mumbai. By order dated 3 March 1995, his complaint was dismissed. The Petitioner filed Writ Petition No.3262/1995 which was dismissed by the learned Single Judge of this Court on 2 August 2002. The Petitioner filed Special Leave Petition No.21555/2002 which was withdrawn. Thereafter the Petitioner filed Letters Patent Appeal against the order of the learned Single Judge which was rejected by order dated 15 December 2003 noting that none appeared for the Appellant and recording that there was no patent illegality in the order impugned in the appeal. The Petitioner moved for recalling the order dated 15 December 2003 which was not entertained. Thereafter again the Petitioner moved the Hon’ble Supreme Court, that too, after the delay of three years, which was not condoned.

3. In these circumstances, at each level, the impugned order of termination has attained finality. Yet, now this writ petition is filed seeking to set aside the order of termination and the order passed by the learned Single Judge dated 2 August 2022.

4. The above narration of facts and the manner in which the prayers are made would show that this petition is entirely an abuse of process of law, and a harassment to the Respondents.

5. Writ petition is dismissed.

6. It is only because the Petitioner is not before us, we have not imposed costs.

(M.M. SATHAYE, J.)

(NITIN JAMDAR, J.)