



Niti

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
WRIT PETITION NO.148 OF 2025

**SIDDHARTH SHIVNATH SHIRODKAR AND
ANR**

... PETITIONERS

Versus

**STATE OF GOA, THR. CHIEF SECRETARY
AND 4 ORS**

... RESPONDENTS

Ms Smita S. Gawas with Mr S. Malik, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr S. Priolkar, Additional Government Advocate for Respondent
No.1 - State.

Mr Shirin Naik with Mr Aniket Tari, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

**CORAM:- BHARATI DANGRE &
NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, JJ.**

DATED :- 23rd April, 2025

ORAL ORDER : (Per Bharati Dangre, J.)

The petitioners have come with a very peculiar case before us as they are aggrieved by issuance of Income Certificate by the Chief Officer of Valpoi Municipality in favour of respondent no.3.

2. The case of the petitioners in the petition is that the Income Certificate has been obtained by suppressing true and correct information and by making the disclosure that his income from all sources does not exceed Rs.2,76,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Seventy

Six Thousand only) per month.

3. The petitioners have placed on record the photographs of the car as well as the Air Conditioner fitted to the house of respondent no.3 and it is a pleaded case of the petitioners that he is enjoying all luxuries of life but at the same time, has obtained Income Certificate on the basis of which he is likely to claim certain benefits.

4. We persistently asked the Counsel for the petitioners about her locus to file the present Writ Petition, which seek a writ of mandamus to quash and set aside the Income Certificate dated 23.05.2024 issued to respondent no.3 and request for a detail inquiry with regard to issue of Income Certificate for respondent no.3 without following due procedure of law.

5. In the whole pleadings of the petitioners, we do not find that any of their legal or fundamental rights been violated by the issuance of the certificate in favour of respondent no.3.

We agree that there may be numerous illegalities which may be occurring around the petitioners or in the State or in the whole of country but for invoking our writ jurisdiction, unless and until any of such activities are shown to be violating the fundamental right or legal right available to the person approaching us, we are bound to exercise our jurisdiction in redressal of such grievances.

Hence, we do not deem it appropriate to entertain the petitioners.

The Writ Petition, is therefore, dismissed.

NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, J.

BHARATI DANGRE, J.