

Gujarat High Court

Hasmukhbhai vs South on 25 November, 2010

Author: Jayant Patel,&NbspHonourable S.R.Brahmbhatt,&Nbsp
Gujarat High Court Case Information System

Print

SCA/5266/2002 3/ 3 JUDGMENT

IN
THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL
CIVIL APPLICATION No. 5266 of 2002

For
Approval and Signature:

HONOURABLE
MR.JUSTICE JAYANT PATEL

HONOURABLE
MR.JUSTICE S.R.BRAHMBHATT

=====

1

Whether

Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?

2

To be

referred to the Reporter or not ?

3

Whether

their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?

4

Whether

this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder ?

5

Whether

it is to be circulated to the civil judge ?

=====

HASMUKHBHAI

HARIBHAI PATEL & 2 - Petitioner(s)

Versus

SOUTH

GUJARAT UNIVERSITY & 3 - Respondent(s)

=====

Appearance

:

MR

PARESH UPADHYAY for

Petitioner(s) : 1 - 3.

MR DC DAVE for Respondent(s) : 1 -

4.

=====

CORAM

:

HONOURABLE

MR.JUSTICE JAYANT PATEL

and

HONOURABLE

MR. JUSTICE S.R. BRAHMBHATT

Date

: 15/11/2010

ORAL

JUDGMENT

(Per : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE JAYANT PATEL) The petitioners, by this petition, have prayed for appropriate directions to the respondents to hold the election of ordinary members to the Senate of the South Gujarat University and more particularly from the constituencies of Registered Graduates and Teachers and a further prayer is made to direct the respondents not to constitute the authorities under Section 15 of the South Gujarat University Act, 1965, excluding the consideration of the representation of the senate members from the constituencies of Registered Members.

Ms.Marshal Pandya for Mr.Upadhyay states that she has not received any instruction from her clients as to whether the petition survives or not.

It appears from the record of the special civil application that the General Body was to be constituted for a period of five years. The petition came to be filed in the year 2002 and by afflux of time, pending the petition, the said period of five years is over.

Under these circumstances, no useful purpose would be served in examining the questions, which are raised in the petition for academic purpose, as the petition has become infructuous by afflux of time.

Hence, the petition is disposed of as having become infructuous. Rule discharged. No order as to costs.

(Jayant Patel, J.) (S.

R. Brahmabhatt, J.) vinod Top