



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

SUO MOTU PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 3 OF 2023

JAYANT
VISHWANATH
SALUNKE

Digitally signed by
JAYANT VISHWANATH
SALUNKE
Date: 2025.04.18
00:48:18 +0530

High Court of Judicature at Bombay on its own motion	}	
	}	Petitioner
versus		
Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai & Ors.	}	
	}	Respondents

Mr. Jamshed Mistry, *Amicus Curiae*, with
Ms. Ronita Bhattacharya-Bector present.

Mr. Anil C. Singh, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Chaitalee Deochake i/b. Ms. Komal Punjabi
for respondent no. 1.

Ms. P. H. Kantharia, Government Pleader with
Mr. Abhay L. Patki, Additional Government
Pleader for respondent no. 2.

Mr. Akshay Shinde for respondent no. 3.

Mr. Prashant Chawan, Senior Advocate i/b.
Ms. Reshmarani Nathani for respondent no. 4

**WITH
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 54 OF 2024

Access to Hope through Sanket K. Khadilkar, Managing Trustee	}	
	}	Petitioner
versus		
Brihanmumbai Electric Supply and Transport (BEST) & Ors.	}	
	}	Respondents

Adv. Sahana Manjesh for petitioner.

Mr. Nikhil Sakhardande, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Sagar Shetty, Ms. Shubhra
Swami paranjape, and Ms. Shraddha
Nagaonkar for respondent no. 1 (BEST).

Mr. P. P. Kakade, Government Pleader
with Ms. R. A. Salunkhe, AGP for
respondent no. 3.

**CORAM: ALOK ARADHE, CJ. &
M. S. KARNIK, J.**

DATE: APRIL 17, 2025

ORDER: (Per Chief Justice)

1. Suo Motu Public Interest Litigation No. 3 of 2023 relates to installation of poles/bollards at the entrance of footpaths in the City of Mumbai, which have rendered footpaths inaccessible to those who are differently abled persons and those who are using wheelchairs.

2. Public Interest Litigation No. 54 of 2024 has been filed seeking direction to respondents 1 to 3 to implement the Accessibility Guidelines for Bus Stops and Bus Terminals, 2021 for Mumbai and to implement the Harmonised Guidelines and Space Standards for Barrier Free Built Environment, 2016 with respect to buses and bus terminals in Mumbai. The petitioner in the said PIL, in addition, seeks a direction to respondents 1 to 3 to implement the Bus Body Code as specified in GSR No. 895(E) dated 20th September 2016 in Mumbai.

3. Mr. Anil Singh, learned senior counsel appearing for the Municipal Corporation, on instructions, states that all the poles/bollards put at the entrance of footpaths, which were causing obstructions and were inaccessible for the persons who are differently abled and using wheelchairs, have been removed. It is further submitted by him that the Municipal Corporation has set up a grievance redressal system and in case any differently

abled person is unable to use the footpaths, he is at liberty to lodge complaint with the Assistant Municipal Commissioner of the local ward office.

4. In compliance of the order dated 27th January 2025, the State Advisory Board on Disability for differently abled persons under section 66 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 has been constituted. The minutes of the meeting dated 5th March 2025 of the State Advisory Board on Disability have been placed on record.

5. In the facts and circumstances of the case, we deem it appropriate to direct the State Advisory Board on Disability to consider the prayers made in PIL/54/2024 expeditiously and to take appropriate action for redressal of the grievances of the differently abled persons. Needless to state that any other differently abled person, who has any grievance, shall be at liberty to approach the State Advisory Board on Disability.

6. Before parting, we place on record our appreciation for the able assistance offered by Mr. Jamshed Mistry, learned *Amicus Curiae*.

7. With the aforesaid directions, both the PILs are disposed of.

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)