

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 96 OF 2025

Viki Ashok Mane.

...Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Others.

...Respondents.

*Mr. D. V. Sutar, Ms. Shruti P. Ghodake, Ms. Reshma Adnaik and Mr. S. M. Patil
for the Petitioner.*

Mr. V. M. Mali, AGP for the Respondent-State.

**Coram : Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi &
Nandesh S. Deshpande, JJ.**

Date : June 9, 2026.

ORDER:

1. Present petition has been filed for the following reliefs
contending that these reliefs are of public interest nature :

“(a) This Hon'ble Court be pleased to issue a Writ of Mandamus and/or Writ in the Nature of Mandamus, order or direction under Art. 226 of Constitution of India, directing the respondent no. 1 to 4 to reverify all the documents pertaining to the registration of 2987 Maharashtra Building and Other Construction Workers and thereafter take appropriate actions accordingly.

(b) This Hon'ble Court be pleased to issue a Writ of Mandamus and/or Writ in the Nature of Mandamus, order or direction under Art. 226 of Constitution of India, directing the respondent no. 1 to take appropriate action against respondent no 3 and 4 having failed to perform their duties and for their dereliction of duty in accordance with law.

(c) This Hon'ble Court be pleased to further direct the respondent no 1 to decide the representation submitted by the petitioner dtd 29.4.2022 and 21.10.2022 and take appropriate accordingly action.”

2. The Petitioner has come with the case that Respondent No.4 had cancelled the registrations of 2,987 building and construction workers contending that it was a bogus registration. According to the Petitioner, there was no verification of documents pertaining to these registrations. The Petitioner contends that he is involved in the work of demolition of old buildings and he himself is a contractor; he is closely connected with the building and other construction workers for their welfare and to register them for the schemes floated by the Respondent Nos. 1 to 3. When a news item was published in marathi newspaper, it was learnt by the Petitioner that Respondent No.5 has sought certain documents from one Mr. Aniruddh Patil, who has issued false and bogus certificates to almost 2,987 building and other construction workers. A raid was conducted by Respondent No. 5, and registration of those workers was cancelled. The Petitioner had then under the Right to Information Act sought information in respect of those cancellations as to whether any verification has been done or not. However, no information has been supplied to him and therefore it is stated that the present petition has been filed so also a representation has been made by the Petitioner on 29th April 2022 as well as on 21st December 2022 to the Respondent No. 1 which should be decided.

3. Heard learned Advocate Mr. D. V. Sutar for the Petitioner and learned AGP Mr. V. M. Mali for the Respondent-State.

4. The learned advocate for the Petitioner has taken us through the documents and submits that the Petitioner had made queries and representations have not been decided.

5. Learned AGP objects on the basis of affidavit of Miss. Janki Madhavarao Bhoite, Assistant Commissioner of Labour, Ichalkaranji, District Kolhapur wherein *locus standi* of the Petitioner has been challenged and then relying upon the provisions of the Building and Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment and Condition of Service) Act, 1996. She has stated that the Respondent No. 5 had conducted raid on the basis of information received. In short, she has stated that proper procedure was followed before the cancellation of registration of those workers.

6. Here, the first and foremost fact required to be noted is that in the tile of the petition, the Petitioner has given his occupation as “worker” so also in the verification also on oath it is stated that his occupation is “worker”. In the body of petition, then the Petitioner states that he is a “contractor” who takes contract of demolition of old buildings. In order to support this fact, the Petitioner has not produced any document. The communication in the form of RTI applications cannot be said to be corroborative of the contention of Petitioner. Further, how the Petitioner is concerned with those 2,987 building and other construction workers has not been demonstrated. Not a single

name amongst those workers has been disclosed who has been deprived of the schemes. If at all any person who was duly registered and has been deprived of any scheme, only that person will have a right to agitate and approach the appropriate authority for redressal. A vague allegation has been made. Considering non disclosure of names of any of any of those persons, we do not find that any public interest is involved in the matter. We, therefore, dismiss the present petition. The petition, therefore stands dismissed with no order as to costs.

[NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, J.]

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.]