IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition (PIL) No. 79 of 2011

Mrs. Gauri Maulekhi. Petitioner

Versus

State of Uttarakhand & others.

..... Respondents

Mr. Pankaj Miglani, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Kumar, Standing Counsel for the State of Uttarakhand / respondent Nos. 1 to 5.

Mr. V.K. Kohli, Senior Advocate, with Ms. Vandana Singh, Advocate for respondent No. 7.

JUDGMENT

Coram: Hon'ble Barin Ghosh, C.J. Hon'ble U.C. Dhyani, J.

BARIN GHOSH, C. J. (Oral)

In the Public Interest Litigation, there is nothing further to be done, as the petitioner is no longer serious to establish the breaches, which were allegedly caused by respondent No. 7. However, at the request of the Court, respondent No. 7 has given a proposal for further improvement of the park. To that, the State Government has objected to some extent.

2. We, accordingly, dispose of the writ petition by directing respondent No. 7 to make those improvements, as have been submitted by him in his affidavit, except those which have been objected in the affidavit filed by the State Government.

(U.C. Dhyani, J.) 25.06.2012

(Barin Ghosh, C. J.) 25.06.2012

G