

**IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT
BOMBAY.
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. OF 2017**

DISTRICT: MUMBAI

In the matter of Articles 12, 14, 21,
29(2) and 226 of the Constitution of
India;

AND

In the matter of Maharashtra Public
Universities Act, 2016.

1. Sachin s/o Bajirao Pawar,
Age: 29 years, Occu.: student,
D-79, Parshuram Nagar,
J.D. Ambedkar Marg,
Kalachowky, Mumbai-33.
2. Abhishek s/o Subhash Bhat
Age: 24 years, Occu.: student

R/o 14 B Skylark, Angellor Society,
Near Holy family Church,
Pestom Sagar, Road No.-4,
Chembur- 400089.

3. Ravishekhar s/o Devanand Pandey,
Age: 22 years, Occu. student,
R/o Flat No. 201, Plot 231,
Kanchan CHS Sector-21,
Nerul (E), Navi Mumbai.

Versus

1. State of Maharashtra,
Through its Secretary,
Department of Higher and Technical Education,
Mantralaya,
Mumbai-32.
2. The Director,
Directorate of Higher Education,
Shivaji Nagar, Pune.
3. University of Mumbai,
Through its Registrar,
M.G.Road, Fort, Mumbai-400 032.
4. The Chancellor of University of Mumbai,
Rajbhawan,
Mumbai-35.
5. The Director of Examinations and Evaluation,
University of Mumbai,
Vidyanagari Campus, Kalina,
Santacruz (East), Mumbai 400 098.

**TO THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND THE OTHER HON'BLE PUISNE JUDGES
OF THE HIGH COURT AT BOMBAY.**

**THE HUMBLE PETITION
OF THE ABOVE
PETITIONERS**

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH AS UNDER:

1. The petitioners are citizens of India. The petitioners have appeared in final year LLB. examination held in May, 2017 by the University of Mumbai.
2. The petitioner No. 1 has studied law course from New Law College, Senapati Bapat Marg, Mahim and the petitioner No. 2 has studied law course from Vivekanand Education Society's VES Law College, Chembur, whereas the petitioner No. 3 has studied from D Y Patil College of Law, Navi Mumbai.
3. The petitioner No. 1 had opted Intellectual Property Rights with Law and Medicines, the petitioner No. 2 had opted for IPR and Law relating to Women and Children whereas the petitioner No.3 had opted Law and Medicine with Banking Law and Negotiable Instruments Act as optional subjects. The examination of LLB (semester VI) (three years course) in respect of petitioner No. 1 started on 17.05.2017 and ended on 26.05.2017 whereas it commenced on 19.05.2017 and ended on 30.05.2017 so far petitioner No. 2 is concerned. As far as the petitioner No. 3 is concerned, the examination of LLB (semester X)(five year course) started on 17.05.2017 and ended on 25.05.2017. The copy of examination timetable published by the

officiating controller of Examinations, University of Mumbai on 17.02.2017 is annexed herewith and marked at **Exhibit “A”** whereas the copies of hall tickets issued by the Director of Board of Examinations and Evaluation, University of Mumbai are annexed herewith and marked at **Exhibits “B”, “C” and “D” respectively.**

4. The petitioners submit that the State Legislature repealed the Maharashtra Universities Act, 1994 and replaced the same by the Maharashtra Public Universities Act, 2016. The Maharashtra Public University Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”) came to be passed so as to provide for academic autonomy and excellence, adequate representation through democratic process, transformation, strengthening and regulating higher education and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto. The Act came to be passed so as to implement recommendations on different aspects of higher education and learning made by the Committees under the chairmanships of Dr. Arun Nigawekar, Dr. Anil Kakodkar, Dr. Ram Takwale and Lt. Mrs. Kumud Bansal.
5. The most important aspect of higher education and learning is the conduct of examinations including

preparation and publication of schedule of examinations for the next academic year, declaration of results etc. which was provided for under Statutes or Directions or Ordinances or Rules framed either under the various Universities' Acts or under the Maharashtra Universities Act, 1994.

6. Section 17(5)(j) of the Act provides that the Director, Board of Examinations and Evaluation shall strive to declare every results within 30 days and shall in any case declare the results within 45 days from the last date of examination in accordance with Section 89 of the Act. It further provides that in case of delay, the Director shall send a detailed report outlining the reasons thereof.
7. Section 88 of the Act provides that before the end of each academic year, University shall prepare and publish a schedule of examinations of the next academic year. The affiliated colleges or recognised institutions shall strictly adhere to the schedule. in case of failure to prepare and publish schedule of examinations for the next academic year and strict adherence thereto the concerned authority or officer of the University shall have to make a reasoned report to the Chancellor's office within thirty days

and the directions and decisions of the Chancellor in that regard shall be final and binding.

8. The petitioners submit that Section 89 of the Act, 2016 provides that the University shall strive to declare the results of every examination conducted by it within thirty days from the last date of examination for that particular course. It further provides that in any case the University shall declare the results within 45 days from the last date of the examination of that course.
9. The Proviso to Section 89 provides that in case the University is unable to finally declare the results of any examination and evaluation within the aforesaid period of forty-five days, Director, Board of Examinations and Evaluation shall prepare a detailed report incorporating the reasons for such delay submit the same through Vice-Chancellor to Chancellor and to the State Government, and the direction of the Chancellor in this regard shall be final and binding.
10. The petitioners submit that the examinations of the petitioners came to an end between 26.05.2017 and 30.05.2017 respectively. However, the respondent University has failed to declare the

results despite lapse of the statutory period of 45 days.

11. The petitioners submit that it is not for the first time that the respondent University has caused inordinate delay in publishing the results of examination. Out of 388 examinations conducted by the respondent University in the second half of 2016, 210 results were declared after the expiry of the statutory period of 45 days, which is evident from the information received under RTI vide communication dated 05.06.2017, copy of which is annexed herewith and marked at **Exhibit “E”**.

12. Akin to the petitioner thousands of students enrolled with the respondent University under various faculties have also appeared in the examinations conducted by the respondent University in the month of May, 2017.

13. In January 2017, Mumbai University Vice-Chancellor Sanjay Deshmukh announced that all the evaluations would be done by the University through an on-screen marking process from April. The initiative was expected to reduce the malpractice of tampering with answer sheets. However, the days, after the announcement was made, were marred by a series of delays — from the

tendering process to setting up the evaluation system which led to chaos like never before.

14. The Hon'ble Chancellor/Governor of Mumbai University had made an announcement that the evaluation would be concluded on or before 15.07.2017 but it appears that such date was merely an empty formality.

15. After missing the first deadline for completion of evaluation of answer sheets, the Governor, Ex-officio Chancellor, Mumbai University redirected the vice-Chancellor to declare the results by 31st July, 2017. It further directed to submit a detailed report in accordance with Section 89 of the Act of 2016 elucidating the measures taken by it so as to expedite the process of the evaluation of the answersheets, which is evident from the Press Note dated 04.07.2017 published on the official website of the Governor of Maharashtra, copy of which is annexed herewith and marked at **Exhibit "F"**.

16. The petitioners submit that the Chancellor, Mumbai University conducted a subsequent review meeting so as to ensure that necessary steps are taken to expedite the assessment process and the results are declared by 31st July, 2017 on 24.07.2017 which is evident from the press note

published on the official website of the Governor of Maharashtra, copy of which is annexed herewith and marked at **Exhibit “G”**.

17. The petitioner No. 1 preferred a representation on 14.08.2017 to the incharge Vice Chancellor of the respondent University since no results came to be declared even after elapse of a fortnight after the expiry of the ultimatum given by the Hon’ble Governor, copy of which is annexed herewith and marked at **Exhibit “H”**.

18. The issue of inordinate delay caused on part of the University was also agitated in the State Assembly sometime at the end of July 2017 wherein it was contended that declaration of results may need further extension. It is pertinent to note that this is not the first time that such delay in publication has been caused; the case was no different last year and the years previous to that.

19. The petitioner No. 3 had applied to several foreign universities one of them being the prestigious Queens Mary University London for Masters in Law and the last date for submission of all necessary documents was on 31.07.2017. But due to the delay in declaration of results, the petitioners had to forgo several opportunities for higher studies which have

not only adversely affected his career but has also left them in mental agony. Had the University declared the results on time as announced, the petitioners would have had the opportunity to pursue their higher education. A copy of the application made to Queen Mary University London by the petitioner No. 3 has been annexed hereto and marked at **Exhibit "I"**.

20. The petitioner No. 3 has therefore been prevented to compete in the selection process for his higher education due to sheer laid back attitude of the respondents and the they are solely to blame for the petitioner No.3 's loss of a year and a fair opportunity to place himself at par with the elite minds of his generation of people through.

21. The petitioners were also prevented from preferring an application for an LLM from the national law universities as well because in order to take the Common Law Entrance Test, the petitioners were required to have their degree, migration certificate, transcript and other documents ready for the interview and further so, the petitioners could not have made a declaration in the application form that they have all the required documents/qualifications required to be a bona fide

student taking the said exam and was prevented from making an application altogether. Furthermore, the petitioners were also prevented to compete for positions in public sector undertakings that select candidate on the basis of Common Law Entrance Test scores.

22. The petitioners submit that the petitioner No. 1 and 2 in the least wanted to do LLM from Pune University as a regular student. Savitribai Phule Pune University, Ganeshkhind, Pune is holding regular classes for LLM course conducted through its Post Graduate Department of Law. The admissions to LLM course of Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune are now closed. The petitioners could not apply in the absence of statement of marks of LLB course. The students can be admitted to LLM course conducted by Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune only on the basis of statements of marks or LLB examinations.

23. The petitioners submit that it is imperative that all the Universities in Maharashtra if not in the entire India must declare the results of LLB course well in advance, at least one week before the start of session of first semester/first year of LLM. All other Universities in Maharashtra except Mumbai, the

session of LLM course has commenced latest by 01 August, 2017.

24. In these competitive world, real struggle of law students for their career, in almost all the fields, starts after passing of LLB examination. The results of LLB examination is therefore, important for almost all competition.
25. The timely holding of LLB examinations and timely declaration of results of LLB examinations is of utmost importance.
26. The marksheets shall be made available to the students in any case by the end of July so that they can seek admission to post graduate courses in law or get enrolled or admitted to the bar. However, their chances of getting admissions to postgraduate courses of law either in Indian or foreign Universities stood marred due to delay in publication of results by the University of Mumbai.
27. The LLB examination being a qualifying examination for admission to LLM course. The University of Mumbai as per the time schedule was required to declare the results in any case by the end of July 2017. The timely declaration of results of LLB examination would have enabled the petitioners to take a decision about their future.

However, due to delay in declaration of results, the petitioners have lost almost all the opportunities of post graduate education such as LLM more particularly, in the Universities/colleges of their choice such Queens Mary University, UK, NLUs in India or Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune. The petitioners could have been saved from facing undesirable hardships had the results of LLB examinations been declared in time.

28. The petitioners would also like to submit that apart from their dream for higher education being trampled over by the respondents, the petitioner has completed their years of college studies but are still unemployed since law firms or counsels that he has approached and have denied him a scope to work with them as they require an enrolment in the State Bar Council which is again not possible as the petitioners are yet to receive their final result and the question of a degree or a provisional degree will not arise at all.

29. The petitioner No. 3 submits that he is now interested to serve the legal division of the Indian Army and wants to apply for the position of Judge Advocate General but is unable to do so at the moment since the results have not yet been

declared. The petitioners apprehend that since the last date for applying is on 23rd August 2017, he will be unable to apply for the same as well and will therefore have to waste an entire year due to the unnecessary lateness in the declaration of results. This will cause great prejudice to the career of the petitioners and adversely impact them psychologically to great extents.

30. The petitioners further submit that the respondent University is acting in gross violation of Sections 89 of the Act, 2016, wherein it is specifically mandated that results of every examination shall be declared within thirty days from the last date of the examination for that particular course and such declaration of results must be made latest within forty five days from the last date of examination. Since the last date of examination of the petitioners were on 30th May 2017, as it would appear from the time table for the petitioners final examination, the respondents were duty bound to publish the results by 15th July 2017 latest or show cause as to why there is such delay but as it would appear, nothing of this sort has been undertaken and/or complied by the respondents and they are in violation of the statute.

31. The petitioners further submit that although Section 89 of the Maharashtra Public University Act, 2016 allows the declaration of results even after forty five days but the cause for such delay must be detailed out through a report prepared by the Director, Board of Examinations and Evaluations wherein the reasons for the delay must be mentioned and such report needs to be submitted to the Chancellor through the Vice Chancellor and also to the State Government and the direction issued by the Chancellor in this regard shall be final and binding. In this instant petition, it is seen that neither was the statutory thirty days or maximum of forty five days adhered to and neither was there any report prepared by the Director, Board of Examinations and Evaluations explaining the reasons for such delay or any exact date on which the results are to be declared. The Chancellor has made atleast three announcements with regard to the date for publication however has failed to adhere to any of them.

32. The petitioners submit that there is utter chaos and confusion with regard to the declaration of results for examinations and that there is no certainty as to when the results will be declared and

the petitioners along with other students of this present year are in voidness and darkness about their future. The petitioners have already lost their chances for pursuing higher education and his seniority status on the Bar rolls will also be affected and attributed to the delay in publication of results that has prevented them from enrolment.

33. The petitioners is also suffering financial loss due to unemployment since they do not possess the documents required to enroll themselves in the Bar and is therefore not being able to earn livelihood for themselves and support their family, all of which are attributed and boils down to the failure of declaration of results.

34. It appears from the news reports and press release that the Chancellor and Governor of Maharashtra convened a meeting to review progress of declaration of Mumbai University results for the year 2017. The Hon'ble Chief Minister, the Minister of Higher and Technical Education, Minister of STate for Higher and TEchnical education alongwith officers of the University at Rajbhawan were present for the meeting.

35. The In-charge Vice Chancellor of the University presented the current status of the results. The

Incharge Vice Chancellor assured that all efforts are made for earlier declaration of results including mobilising teachers for remaining evaluation as also dealing with technical issues On-line system as early as possible.

36. The Hon'ble Chancellor and Chief Minister emphasised that all the results should be declared at the earliest and that no student should suffer on account of delay in declaration of results. They have directed Higher and Technical Education Department, the Director of Higher Education and Vice Chancellors of other Universities in the state to take necessary steps to ensure that the admissions of students from Mumbai University pursuing higher education should be carried out without any hindrances.

37. The Higher and Technical Education Department has directed to extend the cut off date to facilitate students of Mumbai University to retain their admissions. The Hon'ble Governor and the Hon'ble Chief Minister have further directed that in case any student miss out the admission because they could not furnish required eligibility within stipulated time period and if they are found eligible subsequently, then such students to be considered for admissions

in supernumerary seats in consultation with concerned apex regulatory body. It is also directed to inform all Universities to postpone the date of registration and allocate over above quota to accommodate MU students. Further direction is issued to admit students provisionally based on an undertaking stating that their admissions would be provisional and subject to fulfilment of the eligibility criteria. The Mumbai University is directed to setup Results Grievance Redressal Cells in which all the issues pertaining to results including evaluation should be addressed.

38. According to the Hon'ble Governor and the Hon'ble Chief Minister, it is an extraordinary situation warranting the Vice Chancellor of the University of Mumbai to take appropriate decisions in the Board Examination and Evaluation to facilitate earliest possible declaration of results.

39. It is further instructed that the Academic Calendar shall be suitably revised taking into consideration the stipulation of 90 teaching days in a Semester as per the UGC policy and to compensate the academic loss to the students, if any. The copy of the press release issued by the

Hon'ble Chancellor and Governor on 18.08.2017 is annexed herewith and marked at **Exhibit "J"**.

40. The petitioners submit that the meeting convened by the Hon'ble Governor regarding declaration of results of the University of Mumbai for the year 2017 on 18.08.2017 and its outcome is not going to salvage the situation, if any. Such meeting ought to have been convened and decision thereon was required to be taken in second week of June when all the authorities became alive of the problem and its magnitude.

41. The delayed meeting and any decision is nothing but a farce or dramatic design of certain authorities so that they can get away from the consequences. It is only offering a lip service to the cause of education. It also mean the authorities are trying to shield them from possible attacks. It is nothing but a face saving formula.

42. The petitioners submit that when admissions in all other Universities in Maharashtra are almost closed, how the cut off dates can now be extended is a riddle to be solved.

43. It is doubtful all such measures even if adopted would not fructify because delay is such that nothing can be done to salvage the situation. The

last minutes efforts would not reverse the clock as the time has gone beyond reproach. Such a delayed meeting to review the progress of declaration of MU results by the Chancellor offers no solace to the untold hardships suffered by the students due to inordinate delay in declaration of results.

44. No amount of last minutes efforts would compensate woes and agonies of the palpitating students. The harm already done to the cause of education cannot now be undone. The proposed Results Grievance Redressal Cell would do nothing except postmortem job.

45. In order to implement the proposed decision taken in the meeting convened by the Hon'ble Chancellor to admit students against supernumerary seats in future, no legal apparatus is in place. Such a decision is not only difficult to be implemented and impracticable, will create many problems than it can offer to solve. The decision to review the Academic Calendar would delay schedule of examinations for the next academic year.

46. The petitioners submit that their problem is generic in nature as the same would be faced by the entire students community who have appeared in

the examination of final year of UG courses from Mumbai University held in May-June, 2017.

47. The petitioners submit that where breach is by way of illegal denial of admissions to deserving and meritorious students, monetary compensation although necessary, cannot be adequate because deprivation affects academic career of students that too due to fault of the authorities of the University and also the Government. The petitioners should not suffer due to fault of the authorities and therefore, in addition to compensation to the petitioners and all those who have suffered at the hands of Mumbai University, a responsibility has to be fixed on all those concerned, if necessary by constituting a Commission of Enquiry under the Commissions of Enquiry Act, 1952.

48. The problem of delay in declaration of results so far Mumbai University is concerned is recurring, perennial and perpetual as a result of which many meritorious students including the petitioners have suffered, inasmuch as they have failed to get admissions in Universities or Colleges of their choice due to fault of authorities of Mumbai University and the State Government.

49. A grant of monetary compensation cannot be considered as a sole and adequate remedy for the students who have been deprived of admissions to the courses in Universities/colleges of their choice and therefore, the petitioners are approaching this Hon'ble Court against neglect and failure to perform duties by the respondents which has led to violation of fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 14, 16, 19(1)(a), 19(1)(g) and 21 of the Constitution of India. Unless, the erring officials either of the Mumbai University or the Department of Higher and Technical Education are made liable by fixing responsibility on them and launching prosecutions and disciplinary actions against them, nothing would redress the grievances or the remedy the situation. In order to establish rule of law and subserve the cause of real justice, it would be necessary to order an inquiry through Commission of Inquiry in addition to grant of compensation.
50. The petitioners submit that compensation cannot alone be adequate for wrongful deprivation of educational as well as employment facilities unless the wrong doers are brought to books and punished for their misdeeds.

51. The petitioners have undergone mental trauma and are feeling disgusted due to such a sorry state of affair. The authorities of the University are indulging in blame game in as much as the Vice Chancellor, Shri. Sanjay Deshmukh who has conveniently proceeded or forced to proceed on leave is attributing the responsibility to the professor for deliberately mixing up the answer scripts with one another whereas the professors involved in the process of assessment or evaluation are blaming the University administration for introducing Digital Assessment i.e. On Screen Marking without necessary training and the infrastructure being in place. It has become therefore necessary to fix liability on all those responsible and ensure that the guilty are punished.

52. If it is found that the teachers were not cooperating in the process of conduct of assessment and evaluation of answer sheets, they can be dealt with by initiating departmental enquiries as well as criminal prosecution against them. Similarly, if the Vice Chancellor is found to be negligent and careless in discharge of his duties, necessary penal action can be taken against him.

53. No laxity or evil design or incurable greed of the authorities shall be tolerated. Therefore, it has become necessary to appoint Commission of Inquiry which will enquire into the causes and propose the action against the recalcitrant and erring officials to be taken and to offer remedies to get over the most recurring problem.

54. The time has come that the Commission of Inquiry be appointed to go into the causes and offer permanent solutions to the problem and also fix all those responsible.

55. Being aggrieved by non-declaration of results of LLB examination within statutory period and deprivation of educational career and also the future career, the petitioners challenge the legality, validity and correctness of the same amongst others on the following grounds:

GROUND:

- I. At the outset there has been a gross violation of the provisions of the Maharashtra Public Universities Act, 2016 which has deprived the petitioners of future educational and job opportunities whereas it is difficult to measure loss of educational and future career with exactitude. As the Bombay University failed to declare the results within stipulated period,

the petitioners are denied admissions in Universities/Colleges of their choice such as Queens Mary University (UK), NLUs in India and PG Department of Law, Savitribai Phule Pune University.

- II.** The petitioners have lost several job opportunities and would suffer several other opportunities even in future due to inordinate delay in declaration of their results.
- III.** The petitioners are denied employment in the capacity of advocates, associates at various chambers/law firms due to non-enrolment with the Bar Council of Maharashtra and Goa as against several law graduates from other Universities who are enrolled with the Bar Council. The petitioners are deprived of earning opportunity without any fault on their part.
- IV.** The petitioners have lost opportunity to seek and obtain admissions to LLM courses offered by various foreign as well as domestic Universities due to non-completion of essential formalities owing to delayed declaration of results.
- V.** The petitioners are prevented from further education due to the oblivious and the inactive approach of the respondent University.

- VI.** An inaction on part of the respondents in declaring the results in time and adopting measures which the authorities are now contemplating way back in middle of June, the same has caused irreparable loss to educational as well as employment career of the petitioners. Such a blatant violation of the fundamental rights of the petitioners, under Articles 14, 16, 19(1)(a), 19(1)(g) and 21 of the Constitution of India needs to be redressed by devising remedies including the application of doctrine of restitution to meet the loss suffered by the petitioners.
- VII.** The petitioner No. 3 could not apply to Judge Advocate General (JAG) examination, for which last date of registration is 23 August 2017 as even if the results are declared by then, the petitioner No. 3 could not get original marksheet and the degree certificate in order to apply for the same.
- VIII.** Delay in declaration of results of examination/revaluation has become an order of the day whereas the respondents have over the years done little or nothing to shorten the time required for publication of results.
56. The petitioners have approached the respondent University on several occasions but bore no fruits and therefore left with no course but to approach

this Hon'ble Court. The petitioners, have, therefore, no efficacious, alternative and expeditious remedy except by way of present writ petition.

57. PRAYERS:

IN VIEW OF THE ABOVE CIRCUMSTANCES, THE PETITIONER WOULD BE GRACIOUSLY PLEASED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA TO:

A. To direct the respondents to declare the results of law examinations held by Mumbai University within three days by issuing a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction as the case may be;

B. To direct the respondents to pay to the each of the petitioners an amount of Rs. 10,00,000 by way of compensation on account of loss suffered due to loss of educational and employment opportunities and mental agonies suffered by them by issuing a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction as the case may be;

C. To direct the State Government to constitute a **Commission of Inquiry** under the chairmanship of the retd. Judge of the Supreme Court or retired Chief Justice of the High Court to inquire into the

causes of inordinate delay in declaration of results by the Mumbai University and other circumstances such as administrative lapses, gross mismanagement and neglect and dereliction of duties in relation to conduct of examination and declaration of the results by all the concerned including the present respondents, with a further request to the Commission to complete the inquiry and submit the report within 3 months by issuing a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction as the case may be;

D. To direct the respondents to constitute a **high level expert committee** to monitor the declaration of results of every examination each year conducted by Mumbai University within the time stipulated under Section 89 of the Act, 2016, by issuing a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction as the case may be;

E. To direct the respondents to initiate administrative, disciplinary as well as penal action including prosecutions against all those found responsible within a period of four weeks by issuing a writ of

mandamus or any other appropriate writ order or direction as the case may be;

F. To direct the respondents to issue notifications or necessary instructions to all the Universities in Maharashtra so as to admit the students for postgraduate courses by creating adequate supernumerary seats within a week pending hearing and final disposal of the petition;

G. To grant any other relief to which the petitioners are entitled to in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.

**AND FOR THIS ACT OF KINDNESS THE PETITIONERS
AS IN DUTY BOUND SHALL EVER PRAY.**

PLACE: MUMBAI

TALEKAR AND ASSOCIATES

DATE: 19.08.2017

ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONERS