

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (PIL) No. 108 of 2017**

Ankit Gourha S/o Shri N. P.Gourha, Aged About 30 Years R/o Rudra Vihar Colony, Ashok Nagar Chowk, Seepat Road Sarkanda, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. Union of India Secretary Ministry Of Rural Development, Krishi Bhawan New Delhi (India)
2. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Collector, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
4. Superintending Engineer, Pradhanmantri Gram Sadak Yojana, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
5. Executive Engineer, Pradhanmantri Gram Sadak Yojana, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Shri Kishore Narayan, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Y.S. Thakur, Additional Advocate General

Hon'ble Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Justice Sharad Kumar Gupta

Order on Board

Per Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice

07.09.2017

1. The Petitioner complains that very many roads are maintained much below the required standards. He tries to show that there is mis-application and mis-utilization of fund which is available under the Pradhanmantri Gram Sadak Yojana.

2. We are clear in our mind that there can not be a roving enquiry by this Court. It is well within the authority of the competent accounting and auditing heads relating to such matters. That apart, if there is any deficiency in the performance of any contract, that is a matter to be taken up by those who are involved in supervisory sector and ultimately by the Government. If there is any specific complaint for any citizen which would amount to disclosing a cognizable offence, that is a matter taken up before the competent authority which is duly authorised in terms of the laws to initiate enquiry or investigation, as the case may be, touching such issues. We do not see that the jurisdiction of this Court should be extended on the omnibus pleadings that large number of works including those enumerated in paragraph 8.5 of this writ petition are below standard. This all the more so because no effective relief can be granted through the writ court. For the aforesaid reasons, this writ petition fails.
3. In the result, the writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan)
Chief Justice

Sd/-

(Sharad Kumar Gupta)
Judge