

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

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO.15 OF 2013

Vickram Crishna & Ors.

...Petitioners

v/s.

Unique Identification Authority of India
and ors.

...Respondents

Mr.Mihir Desai for petitioners.

**CORAM: MOHIT S. SHAH, C.J. &
ANOOP V. MOHTA, J.****DATE : 18 March 2013****P.C.**

By this petition purporting to be public interest petition, petitioners have challenged the Government of India Notification dated 29 January 2008 (Exh.F) constituting Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI) with the composition of Authority and terms of reference i.e. rules and responsibilities of UIDAI

2. Petitioners have also made a prayer for restraining the respondents from taking any further steps in relation to UIDAI.

3. Learned counsel for petitioners has mainly relied on the Report dated 11 December 2011 of the Standing Committee on Finance on the National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010, and particularly on the observations and recommendations made in Part-II of the Report (pages 359 to 366 of the paper book), with dissents by three members of the Committee.

4. We do not propose to go into merits of the controversy raised in this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, as petitioners cannot pray for writ of mandamus without first making a representation to the concerned Authorities, which are supposed to implement the project and/or to take decision in the matter.

5. We, therefore, dispose of this petition with liberty to the petitioners to make a representation to respondent No.1-Unique Identification Authority of India and also to the Government of India.

6. If such representation is made within two weeks from today, the Unique Identification Authority of India and the Government of India shall take decision on such representation as expeditiously as possible and preferably within four months from the date of receipt of the representation.

7. We may not be treated to have expressed any opinion on merits of the contentions sought to be raised by petitioners.

8. Petition is , accordingly, disposed of.

CHIEF JUSTICE

(ANOOP V MOHTA, J.)