



2025:AHC:177247-DB

## HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 3149 of 2025

Ashvani Goyal

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Uttar Pradesh and 5 others

....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Abhinava Krishna Srivastava,

Siddhartha Krishna Bakhshi

Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C., Akanksha Sharma (S.C.),

Anjali Upadhya, Pranjal Mehrotra,

Rajesh Kumar Singh

## **Chief Justice's Court**

## HON'BLE ARUN BHANSALI, CHIEF JUSTICE HON'BLE KSHITIJ SHAILENDRA, J.

- 1. This petition, purportedly in public interest, has been filed by the petitioner again after his earlier petition was dismissed by order dated 16.09.2025 with the Court observing that it was not satisfied with regard to the *bona fide* and credentials of the petitioner seeking a direction to the respondents to ensure that all the private hospitals in Greater NOIDA and Uttar Pradesh provide 25% OPD free and 10% IPD free.
- 2. A perusal of the petition indicates that there is no basis disclosed in the petition for claiming the said relief.
- 3. Counsel for the petitioner attempted to make reference to order passed in Social Jurists, a Lawyers Group Vs. Government of NCT of Delhi and others: Writ Petition (c) No. 2866 of 2002 and 10697 of 2004, decided on 22.03.2007 by Delhi High Court, however, a perusal of the said order indicates that such requirements were indicated in the letters of allotment to the private hospital, however, no such indication is available in the present petition.
- 4. Counsel for the petitioner made submissions that petitioner has attempted to obtain the letters of allotment under the Right to Information Act, however, the same have not been made available.
- 5. Filing of the petition, in the nature of public interest for the purpose of

WPIL No. 3149 of 2025

2

fishing inquiry, cannot be permitted. If the application filed by the petitioner under RTI is pending and/or has been rejected, the petitioner has to pursue his remedy *qua* the said action and after obtaining documents only, a cause can be pleaded.

6. In view of the above, we do not find any reason to entertain the present petition, the same is, therefore, dismissed.

(Kshitij Shailendra,J.) (Arun Bhansali,CJ.)

October 7, 2025 Mukesh Pal/AKShukla