

Pdp

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 14 OF 2024

Sharmila w/o Sandesh Ghuge .. Petitioner

Versus

University of Mumbai & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr. Sumit Khanna with Mr. Shyam Dewani and Dashang Doshi i/by Dewani Associates for petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Narvankar a/w Raufa Shaikh and Rahul Patil for respondent no.1-UoI.

Mr. Shekhar Jagtap for respondent no.2-BCI.

Mr. Rui Rodrigues for respondent no.3

**CORAM: ALOK ARADHE, CJ. &
M. S. KARNIK, J.**

DATE: 24th APRIL, 2025

P.C.:

1. The petitioner claims herself to be a full-time law faculty teaching at Jitendra Chauhan College of Law, affiliated to the University of Mumnai.

2. In this writ petition, which has been filed as Public Interest Litigation, the petitioner seeks a direction to the University of Mumbai to enforce and ensure compliance with the mandatory 75% attendance requirement for law colleges in accordance with the applicable laws, rules and regulations.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner at length. From the perusal of the PIL we find that the petitioner has neither given any particulars of colleges nor students,

Digitally signed
by PRAVIN
DASHARATH
PANDIT
Date:
2025.04.24
17:38:30 +0530

who are being allowed to appear in the examination without following the mandatory 75% attendance requirement by law colleges. The petitioner, who is employee of Jitendra Chauhan College of Law has not even disclosed the names of students in her own college who are appearing in the examination without compliance with the aforesaid mandatory requirement.

4. The application filed by the petitioner seeking information in this regard is pending before the authorities under the Right to Information Act, 2005. In the absence of any material particulars and in the absence of name of colleges or the students who are appearing in the examination without compliance with the aforesaid mandatory requirement, we are not inclined to entertain the PIL. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file a writ petition/PIL afresh after obtaining better particulars.

5. With the aforesaid liberty, PIL is disposed of.

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)