



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

WRIT PETITION NO.840 OF 2025

[M/s. Talha Enterprise through its Proprietor **..vs..** State of Maharashtra
and Others]

*Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders.*

Court's or Judge's order

Shri. S. P. Bhandarkar, Advocate for Petitioner.
Shri. P. P. Pendke, AGP for Respondents/State.
Shri. D. M. Ailani, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

**CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR AND
RAJ D. WAKODE, JJ.**

DATE : 24th FEBRUARY, 2026.

. In the present matter, the grievance of the petitioner is that despite the Pench Reservoir is awarded to him for fishing purposes, he is not able to carry out fishing activities because of illegal fishing activities are being carried out by local fishermen. The petitioner further contends that though repeatedly he sought police protection and requested the Corporation not to charge lease amount for the period during which he could not carry out the fishing activities, neither police protection was granted nor Corporation considered the request for not charging the lease amount.

2. In the above referred backdrop, if the affidavit of respondent No.5 - Police Station Officer, Parshivni Police Station, is considered, it is stated on affidavit that if respondent No.2 Corporation communicates to him that the contract awarded to the petitioner is in force and that the petitioner is permitted to carry out fishing activities in the said Pench Reservoir, he assures that, on payment of requisite charges, necessary aid would be provided to the petitioner to carry out his legal fishing activities in the said reservoir.

3. In view of the said statement, we direct respondent No.2 to issue such communication, if the petitioner's contract is in existence and subsisting, so that respondent No.5, if required by the petitioner, may provide police protection on making necessary payment or otherwise in accordance with law.

4. Further, the respondent No.2 – Corporation, is directed that if the petitioner makes an application with request not to charge the amount of lease for the period during which he could not carry out the fishing activities, the same shall be considered in accordance with law and the decision taken thereon shall be communicated to the petitioner within four weeks from the date of receipt of such application.

5. In that view of the matter, nothing survives in the present petition. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of, with liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh petition, if such occasion arises.

(RAJ D. WAKODE, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)