



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

WRIT PETITION NO.3615 OF 2025

Sipna Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Thr. President Jagdish M. Gupta, Amravati and ors.

-vs-

State of Maharashtra, Thr. Principal Secretary, Dept. of Road Transport, Mantralaya, Mumbai
and ors.

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and the Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Shri M. P. Karia, Advocate for petitioners.

Shri D. V. Chauhan, Senior Advocate and Government Pleader with Shri J. Y. Ghurde, Assistant Government Pleader for respondent Nos.1 to 6.

Shri N. S. Deshpande, Dy. Solicitor General of India for respondent No.7.

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE AND SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, JJ.

DATE : July 14, 2025

1. Heard.

2. This petition was heard by this Court on 11/07/2025 when it was expressed that the Court is not inclined to entertain the petition particularly having regard to the fact that the petitioners have no legal right.

3. As such, at the request of counsel for the petitioners, we posted the matter for today so as to enable him to take instructions whether the petitioners intend to withdraw the petition or invite the order.

4. Today again an attempt is made by the counsel for the petitioners to argue the matter on merits.

5. The petitioners are intending to have grant from the Central Government routed through the State government for such project of Regional Driving Training Centres in various districts. We do not see any legal right in the petitioners to claim such benefit based on any statutory or other provisions. The petitioners are unable to convince

this Court about their legal right.

6. Nevertheless, Government of India having revisited the scheme has reviewed the same in terms of eligibility criteria, thereby superseding earlier guidelines effective from issuance of same on 15/01/2025. Eventually, it has floated the notice inviting tender (NIT) on 29/02/2024. As such, it was open for the petitioners herein to participate in the tender process.

7. The petitioners having chosen not to participate, therefore, now after lapse of substantial period, according to us, petitioners are not entitled to claim any relief, much less relief claimed in the present petition, particularly, in absence of any legally enforceable right.

8. That being so, no case for causing interference in extra ordinary writ jurisdiction is made out.

9. The petition as such fails, resultantly same is dismissed. No costs.

(Sachin S. Deshmukh, J.)

(Nitin W. Sambre, J.)