



Jose

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

PIL WRIT PETITION NO.10 OF 2025

RADHAKRISHNA VIJAY SALGAONKAR

... Petitioner

Versus

THE CHIEF SECRETARY AND 9 ORS.

... Respondents

Petitioner present in person.

Mr. Deep Shirodkar, Additional Government Advocate for
Respondent Nos. 1 to 4, 8 to 10.

Mr. Shivan Desai with Ms Riya Amonkar, Advocates for
Respondent No.7.

**CORAM: SUMAN SHYAM &
AMIT S. JAMSANDEKAR, JJ.**

DATED: 23rd February, 2026

P.C.:

1. This Public Interest Litigation has been instituted complaining of the lack of adequate transportation facilities for the students of DMC College. In order to substantiate the plea raised in the PIL Writ Petition, the necessary facts and particulars have been narrated, along with supporting documents, which have been taken note of.
2. After the institution of the PILWP, it appears that a meeting was convened by the Respondent No.7, i.e. Kadamba Transport Corporation Limited, in its Head Office at Paraiso De Goa, Alto Porvorim, Bardez-Goa, on 09.01.2026, wherein the issue raised in the PILWP regarding the lack of adequate transportation facilities, faced by

the students of Dnyanprassarak Mandal's College and Research Centre (DMC), was discussed. The meeting was not only attended by the Assistant Director of Transport, but also by the Assistant Director of Higher Education and the Director of Education. Besides the above, the Petitioner was himself present in the meeting.

3. After a threadbare discussion of the issues, a resolution was drawn up. Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the resolution are reproduced hereinbelow for ready reference:

“3. Officials of ADT, Mapusa had informed that they are ready to issue permits to private bus operators for plying additional bus trips to DMC College from Mapusa and back but the Private Bus Operators are not ready to apply for additional trips from Mapusa to DMC College and back even if they are having sufficient spare time during morning and afternoon as all the students are availing half tickets wherein there is no compensation for Private Bus Operators from the Government. Additionally, during morning trip from DMC College to Mapusa goes empty and similarly during afternoon trip from Mapusa to DMC College goes empty which is economically not viable to the Private Bus Owners/Operators due to which they are reluctant to ply additional trips on said route beyond the available stage carriage permits issued by the Directorate of Transport, Government of Goa.

4. Secondly, Mhaji Bus scheme is also notified and launched by the Government of Goa where Private Bus Operators / Owners are also not willing to join under the said scheme The Dy. Director of Transport, Head Quarters highlighted that currently 13 nos. of Private Buses are operating from 07:45 hrs to 08:45 hrs plying at 07:45 hrs, 07:50 hrs, 07:55 hrs, 08:05 hrs, 08:10 hrs, 08:25 hrs, 08:40 hrs and 08:45 hrs carrying approximately 40 nos. students by each bus. They have also issued additional 03 nos. of permits to private bus owners on said route.”

4. In view of the above development, Mr. Desai, learned Counsel for Respondent No.7, submits that adequate transportation facilities are now in place and, therefore, nothing survives for adjudication in this PILWP. Taking note of the above stand of the Respondent No.7, this Court had passed an order dated 02.02.2026, granting time to the Petitioner to respond to the facilities which are now in existence, including the effect of the additional bus service provided in the aforesaid route.

5. Today, when the matter is called out, the Petitioner submits that he is not in possession of any additional information so as to address arguments to the Court since examinations are going on in the DMC.

6. Be that as it may, after going through the contents of the resolution dated 09.01.2026 and upon taking note of the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the Respondent No.7, as noted in our order dated 02.02.2026, we are convinced that the issue raised in the PILWP has been substantially redressed and, therefore, no further direction in the matter is called for, at present. However, if the situation so arises in future, requiring the intervention of the Court in the matter, it would be open for the Petitioner or any other person aggrieved in the matter, to approach this Court again by filing appropriate petition.

7. With the above observation, the PILWP stands disposed of.

AMIT S. JAMSANDEKAR, J.

SUMAN SHYAM, J.