



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

Public Interest Litigation No.19 of 2024

[Dr. Anjan Kumar Chatterjee .vs. The Chancellor of RTMNU and Governor and others]

*Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders.*

Court's or Judge's order

The petitioner in person,
Shri D.V. Chauhan, Government Pleader for respondent nos.1 and 2,
Shri Anand Parchure, Advocate a/w Shri Nikhil Valesha, Advocate for respondent no.6.

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE AND ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.

DATE : 8th MAY, 2024

1. Heard.
2. The prayer is for directions to conduct an enquiry against the respondent no.6 who, at the relevant time, was heading the department of Geology under whose regime Platinum Jubilee celebrations were celebrated.
3. It is the case of the petitioner that he is alumni of geology department of respondent no.4-University and has donated certain amount for celebration of Platinum Jubilee. It is claimed that respondent no.6 who is head of the department of Geology has not followed the prescribed procedure which is provided for the appropriation of amount of the University. It is claimed that the respondent no.6 was holding the said amount in trust.
4. As such, it is claimed that the Committee be constituted so as to enquire into the conduct of the respondent no.6 in the matter of the amount spent in the celebration of Platinum Jubilee.
5. We are came across in the pleadings that the petitioner has already filed Regular Civil Suit No.973/2023 against the respondent nos.3, 5 and 6 before the

Court of Civil Judge, Senior Division, Nagpur in the capacity of elected President, Gondwana Geological Society, Nagpur.

6. The facts remains that there appears to be some personal differences with the respondent no.6 and the petitioner is trying to canvass his personal grievance through Public Interest Litigation.

7. Even otherwise, we are unable to satisfy ourselves from the pleadings and the documents placed on record that there is violation of any rules as has been alleged during the course of argument.

8. That being so, the PIL lacks merit and the same stands dismissed.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)