

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

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO.481 OF 2025
IN
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO.173 OF 2010**

Sarita Khanchandani

....Petitioner

Versus

Aziz Shaikh

The Commissioner,

Ulhasnagar Municipal Corportion & Ors.

....Respondents

Ms. Sarita P. Khanchandani *Petitioner-in-person in CP 481 of 2025.*

Mr. Vijay D. Patil, Senior Advocate i/b Mr. Yogesh Patil *for Respondent No.1 in CP 481 of 2025.*

Mr. Vishwanath Patil a/w Mr. Kedar Nhavkar *for Respondent No.9-MPCB in CP 481 of 2025.*

Ms. Neha S. Bhide, GP a/w Mr. O.A. Chandurkar, Additional GP, Mr. M.M. Pabale, AGP *for Respondent No.10/State in CP 481 of 2025.*

Mr. D.A. Dube a/w Mr. Upendra Lokegaonkar *for Respondent No.3-UOI in PIL 173 of 2010.*

Mr. Ravindra Pachundkar *for Akola Municipal Corporation in PIL 173 of 2010.*

**CORAM: ALOK ARADHE, CJ. &
SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.**

DATE : 24 JULY 2025.

P.C.:

1. This Petition has been filed for non-compliance of the directions contained in the orders dated 13 May 2025 and 16 August 2016 passed in Public Interest Litigation No.173 of 2010.

2. A Bench of this Court in the aforesaid orders had issued various directions with regard to noise pollution. A similar Contempt Petition namely Contempt Petition No.390 of 2018 was filed by one Santosh Shrikrishna Pachalag wherein the Respondents had filed a detailed Affidavit pointing out the steps taken by them to prevent the noise pollution. It has been stated in the Affidavit filed in the aforesaid case that 343 loud speakers had been removed and notice has been given to persons who had installed 767 loud speakers and cases of five persons have been referred to Maharashtra Pollution Control Board. It has also been stated in the aforesaid Affidavit that Inspector General of Police has been appointed as Nodal Officer in respect of 49 Units in the State of Maharashtra to ensure compliance with the provisions of Noise Pollution (Regulation & Control) Rules, 2000.

3. In view of the stand taken by the Respondents in the aforesaid Contempt Petition No.390 of 2018, we find that no case for willful disobedience of the directions contained in the orders issued by this Court is made out as Respondents have made sincere attempts to comply with the said directions.

4. Mr. Patil, the learned Senior Advocate states that Ulhasnagar Municipal Corporation has already provided grievance redressal mechanism in compliance with the directions issued by this Court in Public Interest Litigation No.173 of 2010. This Court cannot monitor compliance with directions already issued and individual case of violation needs to be dealt with by the law enforcing

agencies. It is open for the Petitioner to approach the Nodal Officer/ Grievance Redressal Forum provided by Ulhasnagar Municipal Corporation, in case the directions are not followed in any individual case.

5. Therefore, we are not inclined to proceed further with the Contempt Petition. However, in case the grievance of the Petitioner still persist, Petitioner is at liberty to approach the Nodal Officer appointed by the State Government/Grievance Redressal mechanism created by the Ulhasnagar Municipal Corporation. With the aforesaid liberty, Contempt Petition is **disposed of**.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)

SUDARSHAN
RAJALINGAM
KATKAM
Digitally signed
by
SUDARSHAN
RAJALINGAM
KATKAM
Date:
2025.07.24
15:28:31 +0530