



.min

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 4224 OF 2024

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Magasvargiya Sanskrutik,
Kala Krida and Bahuuddeshiya Mandal Waki

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra, through its Secretary
for Revenue, Animal Husbandary & Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. B.A. Lawate for the petitioner.

Ms. S.D. Vyas, Addl. G.P. a/w. Ms. S.S. Bhende, AGP for the State.

**CORAM : G. S. KULKARNI &
ADVAIT M. SETHNA, JJ.**

DATE : 18 MARCH 2025

P.C.:

1. On 21 March, 2024 we had passed an order directing the State Government to file reply affidavit. It is nearly one year that the reply affidavit has not filed by the State Government. We are bound by the directions of this Court in **Sudhakar Madhukar Patil & Ors. vs. The Collector, Thane** wherein the Court in regard to such negligent approach of the State in not filing the reply, has made the following observations:

“3. Today when the proceedings are listed again, an adjournment is sought by the State as also CIDCO to file reply affidavits.

4. In the above circumstances, when for a period of one year an order passed by this Court directing the respondents to file reply affidavit is not being complied, we have no alternative but to impose costs. Thus, as a matter of last chance, liberty is granted to file reply affidavits not later than 12 September 2024, subject to payment of

cost of Rs.10,000/- each to the petitioners. Stand over to 12 September 2024.

5. We are constrained to pass the aforesaid order as the prior orders passed by the co-ordinate Benches of this Court, setting out specific timelines to file reply affidavits are totally neglected when they were required to be complied. At no point of time during such a long period of more than one year any application was filed on behalf of the respondents seeking an extension of time to file reply affidavits, when the specific orders were staring at the respondents. As if it is a routine “mantra”, the learned AGP as also the learned Counsel for respondent Nos.4 and 5 are instructed to again seek time to file reply, which depicts a very sorry state-of-affairs on the part of the concerned department. In fact, non compliance of the orders passed by this Court and affidavit in reply not being filed, is something which can also be dealt in a different manner while adjudicating the present proceeding.

6. Considering repeated instances of such robotic approach of endless adjournments being sought to file reply affidavits, henceforth we are inclined to take a strict view of the matter more particularly when the orders passed by the Court directing the State/respondents to file reply affidavit within specific timelines are not being complied, unless there is a valid justification and an appropriate application is made in that regard seeking extension of time. In the event there is no justification, we shall not permit the request either for an adjournment or to file reply affidavits except on payment of costs.

7. We also have some doubt whether orders passed by the Court are informed to the concerned department, as in many cases such information is not being put up before the Court. The respondents cannot have an approach that the orders passed by this Court issuing such specific directions are rendered meaningless and the proceedings are to be listed only to be adjourned.

8. This order be forwarded by the learned AGP to the learned Advocate General as also to the learned Government Pleader on the Appellate Side as well as Original Side, so that with the modern I.T. facilities being available, a circular can be issued prescribing an effective procedure in regard to communication of Court orders and a prompt action to file reply affidavits, can be devised, for the office of the learned Government Pleaders (AS & OS) and more particularly when there are Court orders. This would ensure timely affidavits to be filed in compliance of the Court's orders.

9. We may also observe that it has been accepted to be quite easy and/or casual for the respondents to seek time to file affidavits, when it ought not to be so, when specific orders are passed by the Court. The present case is one such example of a casual approach. This also

for the reason that when the petitioners are pursuing proceedings before the Court, they are represented by the Advocates and are incurring costs / expenses on the litigation on every possible listing when an adjournment is sought. The cost we have awarded in the present matter can never compensate the petitioners for the actual expenses which are being incurred by the petitioner in pursuing this petition. Such thought is completely overlooked and absent in the mind of the respondents when repeated adjournments are sought to file reply affidavits so to drag the proceedings without any justification. In fact the State Government is incurring enormous expenditure in paying legal fees in hundreds of matters on such unwarranted adjournments being sought, solely for the fault of the concerned department not providing timely instructions to file reply affidavits. Thus, looked from every angle, the situation of endless adjournments on such count, works against the interest of both the parties. In such circumstances, we also need to ponder as to henceforth should we adopt a realistic approach to compensate the petitioner for a reasonable cost of an adjournment and more particularly, when Senior Counsel are briefed and a high cost of litigation is incurred by the litigant?

10. In our opinion, such aspects are certainly required to be borne in mind while granting adjournments, failing which instead of weeding out such mechanical unwarranted adjournments, we would in fact nurture such culture which has already plagued the departments. Thus, in appropriate cases and when circumstances warrant, certainly the Court would be required to adopt realistic approach on such issues and pass orders to award cost.”

2. In the present case, it is very surprising that for a period of one year despite the clear order of this Court, reply affidavit is not filed. Considering the aforesaid observations as made by the Court, only as a matter of indulgence, we adjourn the matter for two weeks to enable the State Government to place reply affidavit on record. However, this shall be subject to cost of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited by the concerned officer with the Bar Council of Maharashtra and Goa to be utilized for the Advocates Welfare Fund. The condition to pay the cost is condition precedent.

3. Let reply affidavit be served on the advocate for the petitioner well in advance.
4. Stand over to **1 April, 2025 (H.O.B.)**.

[ADVAIT M. SETHNA, J.]

[G. S. KULKARNI, J.]