

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (PIL) NO. OF 2020

In Re: Constitutionality of The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Adhiniyam 1973 and the underlying The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Niyam 1977 thereof as adopted by and applicable to the State of Chhattisgarh.

PETITIONER:

Aman Saxena, son
of Shri Amit Saxena,

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh,
Through Chief Secretary,
Mantralaya, Mahanadi
Bhawan, Naya Raipur
(Chhattisgarh.)
2. Social Welfare Department,
through its Secretary,
Secretariat, Social Welfare
Department, Raipur (C.G.)

**WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA**

The petitioner above named most respectfully begs to submit as follows:

1. **PARTICULARS OF THE PETITIONER:**

As stated above in the Cause Title.

2. **PARTICULARS OF THE RESPONDENTS:**

As stated above in the Cause Title.

3.(A) PARTICULARS OF THE ORDER(S) AGAINST WHICH THE PETITION IS MADE

That, the petitioner, by way of the instant Public Interest Litigation, seeks to invoke extra ordinary writ jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court to remedy the continual breach of fundamental rights of the poor and marginalized, residing within the State of Chhattisgarh, enshrined under the Constitution.

(B) SUBJECT MATTER IN BRIEF:

The Petitioner is an advocate at the High Court of Chhattisgarh, and a resident of the State of Chhattisgarh having been born and brought up in the State. The petitioner deeply cares about the individual autonomy and freedoms accessible to every citizen of the country and hence bona fide represents one of the most marginalized sections of the society through this petition.

After the reorganization of the State of Madhya Pradesh and formation of the new State of Chhattisgarh w.e.f. 01.11.2000, the State of Chhattisgarh adopted certain laws in force in Madhya Pradesh under Section 79 of the Madhya Pradesh Reorganisation Act, 2000. One such Act and rules thereunder are The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Adhiniyam 1973 [Hereinafter "the Act"] and The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Niyam 1977 [Hereinafter "the Rules"], the constitutionality of which is assailed through this Public Interest Litigation for being violative of right to equality, freedom of speech and expression and right to life with utmost dignity propounded under Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

The cumulative effect of the Act and the Rules is that it criminalises begging, loosely defines it to give it an extremely wide and ambiguous ambit and once individuals fall within its clutches, the Act effectively renders them invisible, by confining them to "Certified Institutions" after a truncated, summary judicial procedure. It is based on a philosophy of first criminalising poverty, and then making it invisible by physically removing "offenders" from public spaces. Effectively, it places a cordon sanitaire around the poor and the "undesirable", keeping them from accessing spaces reserved for the use of "good" citizens. They get left behind on the constitutional guarantees of pluralism and inclusiveness.

The Act which empowers police to take beggars off the street, envisions public places as exclusionary, closed off to those who look poor. The Act follows a vicious colonial logic stemming from victorian era and seeks to remove the presence of beggars from the public places lest their presence embarrass the state.

- (C) (I) The present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is being filed by way of Public Interest Litigation and the petitioner has no personal interest in the outcome. The petition is being filed in the interest of poor and one of the extremely marginalized sections of the society i.e. those reliant on begging to subsist their living.
- (II) That, the Petitioner is a young lawyer and practitioner at the High Court of Chhattisgarh. The Petitioner recently returned to the State to practice law at the High Court. The Petitioner deeply cares about individual autonomy, freedoms and citizen rights under the Constitution and believes that they must be enforced to its fullest extent.
- (III) That, the petitioner is filing the present petition on his own and not at the instance of someone else. The Petitioner will be appearing in person and bear all the litigation costs on his own.
- (IV) That, the source of information of the facts pleaded in this Public Interest Litigation is based on information sought from the bare acts, various official Government websites, internet and by personal contacts.
- (V) That, the petitioner has not sent any representations as the law is already in force enacted through the law making powers of the legislature. Its constitutionality must now be tested by the High Court against the bulwark of fundamental rights.
- (VI) That, to the best of the knowledge of the petitioner no other Public Interest Litigation petition raising the similar issues w.r.t. the Act and Rules thereunder in question is filed before this Hon'ble Court or before any other Court.

4. **WHETHER CAVEAT FILED. IF YES, WHETHER COPY OF THE PETITION SUPPLIED TO THE CAVEATOR:**

As per the petitioner's information, no caveat has been filed.

5. **DETAILS OF REMEDIES EXHAUSTED:**

The Petitioner declares that there is no other alternative or efficacious remedy available except to approach before this Hon'ble Court by way of the instant Public Interest Litigation.

6. **MATTER NOT PREVIOUSLY FILED OR PENDING WITH ANY OTHER COURT OF LAW:**

To the best of the knowledge of the petitioner the instant matter is not filed previously or pending with any other Court.

7. **DELAY, IF ANY, IN FILING THE PETITION:**

There is no delay in filing the present writ petition.

8. **FACTS OF THE CASE:**

8.1 That, the Respondent No. 1 is the State of Chhattisgarh [Hereinafter "the State"] represented through its Chief Secretary and the Respondent No. 2 is the Social Welfare Department, State of Chhattisgarh represented through its Secretary. Social Welfare Department is responsible for implementation of The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Adhiniyam 1973 as per Annual Report 2010-11 Vol.1 of the State Planning Board. The relevant pages of the report are enclosed herewith as **Annexure P/1**. Therefore Respondents are amenable to writ jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court.

8.2 That, the Petitioner is filing this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India declare the The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Adhiniyam 1973 [Hereinafter "the Act"] and the underlying The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Niyam 1977 [Hereinafter "the Rules"], in so far as they are applicable to the State of Chhattisgarh, as unconstitutional and violative of Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India. A copy of the Act and Rules is enclosed herewith as **Annexure P/2**.

8.3 That, in view of the M.P. Reorganization Act, 2000, a new State of Chhattisgarh was constituted w.e.f. 01.11.2000. After constitution of the new State, Section 79 of the Madhya Pradesh Reorganisation Act, 2000 empowered the State of Chhattisgarh to adopt and extend any of the laws in force in the erstwhile State of Madhya Pradesh through which the State adopted the said Act and Rules. As per written reply in Lok Sabha to Starred Question Number 357 to be answered on 20.03.2018 by Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, 20 states and 2 UTs, including Chhattisgarh, have Anti Beggary laws. The written reply to the question is enclosed in this petition as **Annexure P/3**.

- 8.4 That, the Act and Rules criminalise begging and deem the poorest of the poor who survive on subsistence gained through alms as criminals. The Act loosely defines begging to give it an extremely wide and ambiguous ambit and once individuals fall within its clutches, the Act effectively renders them invisible, by confining them to “Certified Institutions” after a truncated, summary judicial procedure. It is based on a philosophy of first criminalising poverty, and then making it invisible by physically removing “offenders” from public spaces. Effectively, it places a cordon sanitaire around the poor and the “undesirable”, keeping them from accessing spaces reserved for the use of “good” citizens.
- 8.5 That, the Delhi High Court in *Harsh Mander vs. Union of India* (AIR 2018 Del 188) and Jammu and Kashmir Court in *Suhail Rashid Bhat vs. State of Jammu and Kashmir & Ors* 2019 SCC OnLine J&K 869 have already struck down the Bombay Prevention of Begging Act, 1959, as adopted and extended to the NCT of Delhi, and J&K Prevention of Begging Act, 1960 respectively. It is submitted that The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Adhiniyam 1973 is substantially similar to the aforesaid Acts and hence should be struck down by this Hon’ble Court, in keeping up with the evolving jurisprudence across states with respect to the Anti Beggary Laws.
- 8.6 That, as per the data in the Socio-Economic and Caste Census 2011 Report, also published in a news article in Times of India on July 10, 2015, more than 25000 rural households in Chhattisgarh back in 2011 depended solely on begging for survival. As per written reply in Lok Sabha to Starred Question Number 357 answered on 20.03.2018 by Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment (Annexure P/3), the number of beggars/vagrants in Chhattisgarh as per Census of 2011 was pegged at 10,198 persons. The Times of India news article is enclosed herewith as **Annexure P/4**.
- 8.7 The Act follows a vicious colonial logic. The definition of “begging” is (consciously made) so broad, that “it covers not just an activity (say, “soliciting for alms”), but entire ways of life. What unites these ways of life (singing, dancing, fortune-telling, performing) is their itinerant character. Section 2(a) makes it clear when it uses the bizarre phrase “wandering about.” This gets to the heart of the phobia driving these laws: the fear of shifting populations whose changing movements and patterns makes them “invisible” to the administrator, and therefore, harder to classify, categorise, control, and (yes) extract tax from.

The “taming” of such individuals, groups, and communities was central to the colonial project, both in India and elsewhere. By associating them with hereditary criminality, the British stigmatised and (virtually) enslaved entire nomadic communities by bringing them within the ambit of the vicious Criminal Tribes Act. The myth of “thuggee” (a word still found in the IPC) was employed to the same end. Through vagrancy laws, the British made it impossible for itinerant lifestyles to remain outside the net of punitive legislation. All of this was driven by the imperative to ensure a “settled” population that could be disciplined and taxed with ease. It is trite to say that post-colonial legal logic has, more often than not, replicated this model. The laws of the colonial regime have been turned by post-colonial administrators upon their own people.”¹

8.8 That, the Act and the Rules brandishes the existence itself of at least 10,198 persons residing in this State as illegal. It is violative of fundamental rights enshrined articles 14, 19 and 21 of Part III of the Constitution and must be struck down as Unconstitutional.

9.

RE: The Act and Rules violate freedom of speech and expression under article 19(1)(a)

A Begging is a communicative activity and a form of speech and expression. The Act imposes a complete interdiction and prohibition on begging and criminalises it.

B It cannot be termed as a reasonable restriction under article 19 (2). 19(2) restrictions can only be imposed upon satisfaction of one of the eight reasons enumerated in the clause i.e. in the interest of sovereignty and integrity of India, security of State, friendly relations with a foreign state, public order, decency morality or in relation to contempt of courts, defamation or incitement of an offence. There exists no proximate relation between the Act and the object sought to be achieved.

C The curtailment of freedom of speech and expression of beggars is disproportionate to the situation sought to be addressed and therefore impermissible under 19 (2).

¹ “Something of freedom is yet to come” : The significance of Delhi High Court’s decriminalization of beggary, Gautam Bhatia, August 10,2018, Indconlawphil.wordpress.com

D The offence of begging as defined under section 2(a) suffers from the vice of vagueness and it being over-broad. It leads to chilling effect amongst the populace. This test has been held *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* 2015 5 SCC 1. The legislature has used numerous expressions like “soliciting”, “under any pretence”, “exposing or exhibiting”, “obtaining or exhorting”, “no visible means”, “wandering about”, “in such conditions or manner”, “make it like” which can have different interpretation to different individuals. It encapsulates within it more forms of speeches than is permissible under article 19 (1) and hence, it must be struck down.

RE: The Act and Rules violate freedom of movement under article 19

A Article 19(1)(d) grants freedom of movement to Indian citizens to move freely throughout the territory of India and 19(1)(e) provides right to reside in any part of India. Section 2(a) of the Act specifically mentions public places. Public places by its very definition are meant for enjoyment of all citizens and incorporate within it the right to occupy and use them. The movement of poor and marginalized cannot be restricted under the pretext of perceived nuisance and visual annoyance to a certain class and section of the society.

RE: The Act and Rules ghunder article 14

A The classification under the Act 2019 violates the twin test of classification under Article 14, wherein it requires that (i) there should be a reasonable classification based on intelligible differentia; and, (ii) this classification should have a rational nexus with the objective sought to be achieved ^[1]_{SEP}

B Definition of begging under Section 2(a) fails the settled law with regards classification test. The section groups together begging which is permissible by the District Magistrate/State Government perhaps for a licensed cause along with one that is not, that is for sustaining oneself. It also engulfs both voluntary begging to sustain oneself and forced begging under possible organized syndicates under the broad head of begging.

C Such classification is irrational, unreasonable and discriminatory. The consequence of both licensed and unlicensed begging is seeking alms for charity. It has no intelligible differentia. Similarly, those left without alternative options to survival and those forced into begging by organized syndicates are put together under the same head. This too fails the classification test.

- D** Such classification has no nexus to the object sought to be achieved.
- E** This Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Shayaro Bano v Union of India* (2017) 9 SCC 1 had also noted that “*And a constitutional infirmity is found in Article 14 itself whenever legislation is “manifestly arbitrary” i.e. when it is not fair, not reasonable, discriminatory, not transparent, capricious, biased, with favouritism or nepotism and not in pursuit of promotion of healthy competition and equitable treatment. Positively speaking, it should conform to norms which are rational, informed with reason and guided by public interest, etc.*” The Act is arbitrary and contrary to the rule of law. Instead of providing support and rehabilitation to the beggars, it punishes the poor for being poor and must be struck down by this Hon'ble Court.

RE: The Act and Rules violate right to life with dignity under article 21

- A** Life with essential human dignity is enshrined under article 21 of the Constitution. “*The Constitution guarantees a life with human dignity. It entails right to health, strength of workers, men and women, right of children to be free from abuse, to develop in a healthy manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity, educational opportunities, just and humane conditions of work and maternity benefits. These are basic minimum requirements to enable a person to live with human dignity and no State has the right to take any action which will deprive a person of enjoyment of these basic essentials.*” *Bandhua Mukti Morchi v. Union of India AIR 1984 SC 802*
- B** The legislation is steeped in prejudice against poverty and premised on an absolute presumption of potential criminality of those faced with choicelessness, necessity and undeserved want of those who have no support at all, institutional or otherwise and are bereft of resources of any kind. The legislation in fact manifests the complete apathy of the State and abdication of the Constitutional functions and public law obligations, when instead of providing support, it has criminalized poverty and exposed the extreme poor and marginalized to summary inquiries, penal prosecutions and punishment.
- C** Denial of Right to beg will push the marginalized further towards deprivation. *The criminalization of begging, undeniably adversely impacts the most vulnerable people in the society i.e., that group of people who do not have access to basic essentialities as food, shelter, health and criminalization of begging ignores the reality that persons who are begging are the poorest of the poor and the most marginalized in the society. Suhail Rashid Bhat v. State of J&K (Supra)*

D Criminalisation of begging, detention in the Certified Institutions impeaches the right to privacy guaranteed under the constitution which necessary entails “right to be left alone” by the State.

E Section 6 of the Act, which makes begging an offence and permits imposition of a penalty; Section 4 which enables mandatory arrest without a warrant, detention and imprisonment; Section 5 which permits a summary inquiry and detention for purpose therefore; and Section 27 which envisages punishment for escaping from the place of detention of persons who are compelled to beg in order to meet the basic needs for bare survival which is way below even the minimum level of sustenance, Section 10 which allows for further detention of “incurably helpless beggars” have a clearly disproportionate impact and violate rights of these persons guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India

F Power under Section 9 granting powers to detain persons including children wholly dependant on the beggar is wholly unconstitutional under article 21 for being denied with basic personal liberty to the entire family who beg for lack of an alternative mode of sustenance.

10. **RELIEFS SOUGHT:**

- 10.1 Declare The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Adhiniyam 1973 and the underlying The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Niyam 1977, unconstitutional and violative of Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution.
- 10.2 Any other relief which this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case may kindly be granted in the interest of justice.

Bilaspur

Dated :27.01.2020

Aman Saxena

Petitioner in Person

CERTIFICATE

It is certified that due care has been taken in this case to comply with the provisions of Chhattisgarh High Court Rules.

Bilaspur

Dated :27.01.2020

Aman Saxena

Petitioner in Person

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (PIL) NO. OF 2020

PETITIONER

Aman Saxena

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh &
Others

A F F I D A V I T

I, Aman Saxena,

do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath

as under:

1. That I am the petitioner in the instant case and as such conversant with the facts and circumstances of the case.
2. That the contents of Para-1 to Para-10 of the accompanying writ petition (PIL) have been drafted by me and understand that the same are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Deponent

VERIFICATION

I, Aman Saxena, the deponent above named, do hereby verify that the contents of the foregoing affidavit are true and correct, no part of it is false and nothing material has been concealed there from.

Verified and Signed by me on this 27th day of January 2020 at Bilaspur,
Chhattisgarh.

DEPONENT

Identified by me

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (PIL) NO. OF 2020

PETITIONER

Aman Saxena

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and Ors

I N D E X

Sl. No.	Particulars	Annexure	Page No.
01.	Synopsis and List of Dates and Events	-	
02.	Writ Petition [PIL] under Article 226 of the Constitution of India along with affidavit and certificate	-	
03.	Relevant pages of Annual Report 2010-11, Volume I, State Planning Board	P/1	
04.	Copy of the Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Adhiniyam 1973 and Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Niyam 1977	P/2	
04.	Written reply in Lok Sabha to Starred Question Number 357 to be answered on 20.03.2018 by Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment	P/3	
05.	The Times of India news article dated July 10, 2015	P/4	
08.	Application for waiver of locus standi rule with Affidavit	-	
09.	Additional Affidavit	-	
10.	Application for exemption from payment of security amount along with affidavit.	-	
11.	Vakalatnama	-	

Bilaspur
Dated :27.01.2020

Aman Saxena
Petitioner in Person

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (PIL) NO. _____ OF 2020

PETITIONER

Aman Saxena

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh
& Others

SYNOPSIS

That, the petitioner, by way of the instant Public Interest Litigation, seeks to invoke extra ordinary writ jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court to challenge the constitutionality of The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Adhiniyam 1973 and the underlying The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Niyam 1977.

The aforesaid Act and Rules criminalise the innocuous act of begging in the State of Chhattisgarh and renders the existence of thousands of citizens dependant on begging for survival as criminals. The said Act is part of the family of Anti-Beggary legislations existent in 20 states and 2 UT's. The challenge to the constitutionality is in line with the evolving jurisprudence on unconstitutionality of Anti-Beggary legislations. Such legislations at NCT of Delhi and then followed by Kashmir, were struck down by their respective High Courts, having failed the test of constitutionality and being in violation of article 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution.

The Act vaguely defines begging, criminalises, gives power to the police to detain the beggars for years in Certified Institutions upon a summary trial by the court which can be extended to an indefinite period for an "incurably helpless beggar".

The Act strikes at the heart of dignity and freedoms afforded to individuals under the Constitution, is arbitrary and irrational. The follows a vicious colonial logic aimed at control of itinerant population for the purpose of taxation.

Such a legislation finds no place in a society governed by rule of law and ideals enshrined in the Constitution. Hence this Public Interest Litigation is filed on behalf of poorest of the poor unable to approach this Hon'ble Court.

LIST OF DATES AND EVENTS

01.11.2000

In view of the M.P. Reorganization Act, 2000, a new State of Chhattisgarh has been constituted w.e.f. 01.11.2000. After the constitution of the new State of Chhattisgarh, State of Chhattisgarh adopted The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Adhiniyam 1973 and the underlying The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Niyam 1977 under Section 79 of the M.P. Reorganization Act, 2000.

27-01-2020

The Public Interest Litigation challenging the Constitutionality of The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Adhiniyam 1973 and the underlying The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Niyam 1977 to the extent of its applicability on the State of Chhattisgarh is filed.

Bilaspur

Dated :27.01.2020

Aman Saxena

Petitioner in Person

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

I.A.NO.OF 2020

IN

W.P.[PIL] NO. OF 2020

PETITIONER

Aman Saxena

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh
& Others

APPLICATION FOR WAIVER OF LOCUS STANDI RULE

The petitioner, named above, most respectfully submits as under: -

1. That, the petitioner, by way of the instant Public Interest Litigation, seeks to invoke extra ordinary writ jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court challenging The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Adhiniyam 1973 and the underlying The Chhattisgarh Bhiksha Vritti Nivaran Niyam 1977 to the extent of its applicability on the State of Chhattisgarh through its adoption upon its formation through reorganisation of Madhya Pradesh.
2. That, the petitioner has no personal interest in the matter and he has filed this petition on his own for ensuring that further deprivation of the most marginalized is prevented, therefore, the rule of locus standi may kindly be waived.
3. An affidavit in support is filed herewith.

P R A Y E R

It is therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to waive locus standi rule, in the interest of justice.

Bilaspur

Dated :27.01.2020

Aman Saxena

Counsel for the Petitioner

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (PIL) NO. OF 2020

PETITIONER

Aman Saxena

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh
& Others

A F F I D A V I T

I, Aman Saxena,

do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath

as under:

1. That I am the petitioner in the instant case and as such conversant with the facts and circumstances of the case.
2. That I hereby declare that I have not filed the instant writ petition (PIL) for any personal gain or raising any personal grievance or for a private, ulterior motive or for extraneous consideration.
3. That, the contents of Para 1 to 3 of attached application and for waiver of locus standi rule have been prepared by me and the same are true and correct to the information available and derived from the facts of the case.

Deponent

V E R I F I C A T I O N

I, Aman Saxena, the above named deponent, do hereby verify the affidavit and its contents of Para 1 & 2 above which are true to my personal knowledge and belief.

Verified and sign on this 27th day of January 2020 at Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

Identified by me

Deponent

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (PIL) NO. OF 2020

PETITIONER

Aman Saxena

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh
& Others

ADDITIONAL AFFIDAVIT

I, Aman Saxena,

do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath

as under:

1. That I am the petitioner in the instant case and as such conversant with the facts and circumstances of the case.

2. That, I hereby declare that the I have not filed the instant Writ Petition (PIL) for any personal gain or raising any personal grievance or for a private, ulterior, motives or for extraneous considerations.

3. That, the contents narrated in writ petition & application for waiver of locus standi rules have been drafted as per my instructions and the contents thereof are true and correct to my personal knowledge based on records available with me.

DEPONENT

VERIFICATION

I, Aman Saxena, the above named deponent, do hereby verify the affidavit and its contents of Para 1 & 2 above which are true to my personal knowledge and belief.

Verified and signed on this 27th day of January 2020 at Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

Identified by me

Deponent

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (PIL) NO. OF 2020

PETITIONER

Aman Saxena

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh
& Others

AFFIDAVIT

I, Aman Saxena,

do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath

as under:

1. That I am the petitioner in the instant case and as such conversant with the facts and circumstances of the case.
2. That the contents of Para-1 to Para-3 of the accompanying application for grant of exemption from payment of security amount have been drafted at my instructions and I have read and understood and the same are true and correct to my knowledge and belief except legal submissions.

DEPONENT

VERIFICATION

I, Aman Saxena, the deponent above named, do hereby verify that the contents of the foregoing affidavit are true and correct, no part of it is false and nothing material has been concealed there from.

Verified and Signed by me on this 27th day of January 2020 at Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

Identified by me

Deponent

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

I.A.NO.OF 2020

IN

W.P.[PIL] NO. OF 2020

PETITIONER

Aman Saxena

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh
& Others

**APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM PAYMENT OF
SECURITY DEPOSIT UNDER RULE 81 OF CG HIGH COURT
RULES 2007**

The following is most respectfully submitted on behalf of the petitioner:

1. That, the petitioner, by way of the instant Public Interest Litigation, seeks to invoke extra ordinary writ jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court ventilating common grievance of the poor and most marginalized section of the society residing within the State of Chhattisgarh whose existence itself has been criminalized.
2. That the petitioner has no personal interest in the matter and he has filed this petition on his own for the betterment of public at large therefore the rule of deposit security amount under Rule 81 of the Chhattisgarh High Rules, 2007, may kindly be exempted.
3. That an affidavit in support is filed herewith.

P R A Y E R

It is therefore most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to allow the application and exempt from payment of security deposit under Rule 81 of CG High Court Rules, 2007, in the interest of justice.

Bilaspur

Aman Saxena

Dated :27.01.2020

Counsel for the Petitioner