



CWP-PIL-348-2025

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP-PIL-348-2025
Date of decision: 15.01.2026**

NAVED AND OTHERS

....PETITIONERS

Versus

THE STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

Present: - Ms. Babita Gupta, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Salil Sabhlok, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Neeraj Gupta, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Pritpal Singh Nijjar, Additional Standing Counsel
(Arguing Counsel) and

Ms. Perna Malhotra, Junior Panel Counsel for respondent
No.3-U.T. Chandigarh.

SHEEL NAGU, C.J. (Oral)

The present PIL has been filed seeking expeditious disposal of
MACT matters.

2. However, what is noticeable from the record and the pleadings
in the petition is that petitioners No.1, 3 and 4 have cases pending before
the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, U.T. Chandigarh, as per the contents
of Para 4 of the petition. Petitioner No.2 is the legal heir of claimant in
MACT No.158 of 2020 titled 'Jaswinder Kaur Versus Sandeep Kumar' also
pending before MACT, U.T. Chandigarh.

3. In view of above, all the petitioners are personally interested
in the cause raised herein, which is camouflaged as a Public Interest



CWP-PIL-348-2025

2

Litigation. Therefore, the petition is not maintainable in view of the decision of the Apex Court in ‘Dattaraj Nathuji Thaware Versus State of Maharashtra and others’, (2005) 1 SCC 590. The relevant portion of the paragraph is reproduced as below for the ready reference:

“Para No. 4. xxxxxx There must be real and genuine public interest involved in the litigation and not merely an adventure of a knight errant borne out of wishful thinking. It cannot also be invoked by a person or a body of persons to further his or their personal causes or satisfy his or their personal grudge and enmity. Courts of justice should not be allowed to be polluted by unscrupulous litigants by resorting to the extraordinary jurisdiction. A person acting bona fide and having sufficient interest in the proceeding of public interest litigation will alone have a locus standi and can approach the court to wipe out violation of fundamental rights and genuine infraction of statutory provisions, but not for personal gain or private profit or political motive or any oblique consideration. These aspects were highlighted by this Court in *Janata Dal v. H.S. Chowdhary* and *Kazi Lhendup Dorji v. CBI*. A writ petitioner who comes to the court for relief in public interest must come not only with clean hands like any other writ petitioner but also with a clean heart, clean mind and clean objective. (See *Ramjas Foundation v. Union of India* and *K.R. Srinivas V. R.M. Premchand*.)

Para 12. Public interest litigation is a weapon which has to be used with great care and circumspection and the judiciary has to be extremely careful to see that behind the beautiful veil of public interest, an ugly private malice, vested interest and/or publicity-seeking is not lurking. It is to be used as an effective weapon in the armoury of law for delivering social justice to citizens. The attractive brand name of public interest litigation should not be used for suspicious products of mischief. It should be aimed at redressal of genuine public wrong or public injury and not be publicity-oriented or founded on personal vendetta. As indicated above, court must be careful to see that a body of persons or member of the public, who approaches the court is acting bona fide and not for personal gain or private motive or political motivation or other oblique considerations. The court must not allow its process to be abused for oblique considerations by masked phantoms who monitor at times from behind.”

CWP-PIL-348-2025

3

4. Further, PILs with personal interest are not maintainable in view of the High Court Rules and Orders, Vol. V Chapter I, Part A (C), which is reproduced for ready reference as below:

“Maintainability of Public Interest Litigation Rules, 2010,

2. No Public Interest Litigation shall be entertained by the Registry unless the petitioner(s) has specifically disclosed his credentials and his direct or indirect personal motive or interest involved in the case, if any, by way of an affidavit.”

5. Accordingly, the present PIL stands dismissed.

**(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

15.01.2026
kanika

**(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |