



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION NO. 35 OF 2026
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 14803 OF 2025

Arun Madhu Lohot

..Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & anr.

...Respondents

Mr. Prosper D'Souza, for the Petitioner.

Mr. Dhruti Kapadia, AGP for the Respondent - State.

CORAM: N. J. JAMADAR, J.

DATE : 15th JUNE 2026

P.C.:

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.
2. This petition is filed seeking review of the order passed by this Court on 19th November, 2025 thereby dismissing the WP/14803/2025.
3. In the said petition, the petitioner had prayed for the following reliefs :-

“A] That this Hon’ble High Court may be pleased to issue appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of writ and thereby quash and set aside the impugned order dated 18.2.2025 passed by the State Information Commissioner (Respondent No.1).

B] This Hon’ble High Court be pleased to direct the Respondent No. 1 to fix a date for hearing of the Second Appeal No. 256 of 2024 following the summons notice dated 29.10.2024 and also direct the

Respondent No.2 to comply with the directions given in the clause 1 of the summons dated 29/10/2024.

C] This Hon'ble High Court be pleased to impose Cost of Rs. 5 lakhs on the Respondent No. 2 and the said cost may be paid to the Petitioner as compensation for mental stress caused by the inaction of the Respondent No. 2.

D] That this Hon'ble High Court may direct the Respondent No. 2 to pay the Cost of Rs.25,000 as per the order dated 18.2.2025.

E] Pass such other just and equitable relief in favour of the Petitioner for which the Petitioner deems fit."

4. After hearing the parties, the Writ Petition came to be dismissed, observing *,inter alia*, as under :-

"8. Mr. Bhorge, the learned Counsel for the petitioner, submitted that the orders passed by the State Information Commission do not constitute full redressal of the grievance of the petitioner. An endeavour was made by Mr. Bhorge to press into service the documents and material to show that there has been no action taken by the TMC against the illegal hawkers, stall runners and rickshaw drivers, in Thane. Therefore, the disposal of the second appeal by the State Information Commission has not yielded any result.

9. Mr. Sakhdeo, the learned Counsel for respondent No.2, submitted that the petition is wholly misconceived and the grievance of the petitioner so far as the supply of information under RTI Act, 2005 has, in fact, been completely redressed.

10. The submission of Mr. Sakhdeo appears to carry substance. Evidently, the direction to fix "peremptory date of hearing of the Second Appeal No.256/2024" has become redundant as not only the second appeal but even the proceeding to impose penalty on the PIO,

has been finally decided by the State Information Commission.

11. So far as the prayers for compensation and payment and the recovery of the amount of penalty, suffice to note that the State Information Commission has imposed the maximum penalty of Rs.25,000/- under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act, 2005 and has even ensured its recovery by directing deduction of the said amount in five installments from the salary of the concerned PIO. In this view of the matter, the rest of the prayers in the petition cannot be countenanced.

12. It appears that the principal grievance of the petitioner is that TMC has not taken action against the illegal hawkers and rickshaw drivers etc. The instant petition is not the medium, through which the petitioner can legitimately agitate the said grievance. To the extent of the rights of the petitioner enshrined under the RTI Act, 2005, the grievance seems to have been redressed. Therefore, the petition does not deserve to be entertained any further.”

5. Mr. D’Souza, the learned Counsel for the petitioner, submitted that, on the basis of the observations of the Commission in the order impugned in the said Petition, this Court has incorrectly recorded in Paragraph No. 5 of the petition that, the information sought by the petitioner was furnished to the petitioner on 13th January, 2025 and documents evidencing supply of the said information were tendered before the Commission; Mr. D’Souza, the learned Counsel, further submitted that, the communication dated 13th January, 2025 whereunder the purported information was

allegedly supplied, does not provide the information sought by the Petitioner.

6. I have perused the said communication dated 13th January, 2025 wherein the petitioner was informed that, in regard to the complaint lodged by the petitioner, action for removal of hawkers was taken on 12th October, 17th November, 18th November and 20th November, 2021. It was further informed that, the action of removal of the hawkers was regularly taken by the Anti Encroachment Cell of the Municipal Incorporation.

7. As noted in the order dated 19th November, 2025, the grievance of the petitioner is primarily with regard to the alleged inaction on the part of the Municipal Corporation in taking effective and permanent action against the illegal hawkers. That grievance can be legitimately raised in appropriate proceedings before the competent forum.

8. There is no error apparent on the face of the record nor any other sufficient cause to review the order passed by this Court on 19th November, 2025.

9. Hence, the Review Petition stands dismissed.

[N. J. JAMADAR, J.]