



{1}

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

926 WRIT PETITION NO. 486 OF 2026

Shaikh Babbu Shaikh Karim

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Others

.....

Mr. R.K. Kasat, Advocate h/f Mr. Vaibhav R. Patil, Advocate for the
Petitioner

Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar, AGP for Respondents-State

.....

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.

DATE : 26 MARCH, 2026

PER COURT :-

1. Heard the learned advocate for the petitioner.
2. The petitioner seeks directions to respondents No. 1 and 2 to decide the representation made by him on 11.01.2024, which pertains to holding an enquiry regarding the irregularities allegedly committed by the officials of the Municipal Corporation, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar. It is submitted that the petitioner had received certain information under the Right to Information Act regarding the construction works undertaken in Zone No. 3, Ward No. 57 during the period 2020–2022 through the Municipal Corporation, Aurangabad. It is further submitted that when the petitioner again made an application under the Right to Information Act seeking copies of the maps and Schedule 'B' of the works shown at Sr. Nos. 8 to 12 and 15 on page No.

{2}

20, he received a reply on 08.01.2024 stating that the said works had not received administrative as well as technical sanction and, therefore, the works were cancelled during the Covid-19 period

3. We find that the said information is vague, as the application filed by the petitioner itself is vague. The petitioner is at liberty to produce the documents on which he wants to rely, and the same shall be placed on record along with an additional affidavit within a period of four weeks from today. The petitioner is also directed to deposit an amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- to show his *bona fides*, within a period of four weeks from today.

4. If the petitioner deposits the said amount, list the matter for further consideration on 10.06.2026.

5. In case of failure on the part of the petitioner to deposit the said amount, the petition would stand dismissed automatically without further reference to the Court.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE