

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (PIL) No. 105 of 2017**

1. Rajesh Sharma S/o Shri Raghunandan Prasad Sharma, Aged About 47 Years R/o Shiv Chowk, Ramsagar, Police Station City Kotwali, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.
2. Ashok Kashyap, S/o Late Shri Kishori Lal Kashyap, Aged About 52 Years R/o Sorid Nagar, Bharripara, Dhamtari, Tahsil And District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Collector, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Collector, District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Dhamtari And Registrar And Lok Nyas Of Shri Rashtriya Gaushala Trust, VindhyaWasini Ward, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.
4. The Sub Divisional Forest Officer, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari (Chhattisgarh).
5. Rakesh Kumar Dhruv, Tahsildar And Executive Magistrate, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.
6. Laxmichand Baheti, Ex. President And Present Member Shri Rashtriya Gaushala Trust, VindhyaWasini Ward, Dhamtari Police Station City Kotwali, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.
7. Shri Rashtriya Gaushala Trust, VindhyaWasini Ward, Dhamtari, Police Station City Kotwali, District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh Through Its President Shri Nirmal Baradiya, S/o Late Shri Nemichand Baridiya, Aged About 50 Years, VindhyaWasini Ward, Dhamtari, Police Station City Kotwali, District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri Y.C. Sharma, Advocate
For Respondents/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****31.08.2017**

1. We have heard the learned counsel for the Petitioners and the learned Additional Advocate General.
2. To our query, the learned counsel for the Petitioners submitted that the Petitioners are donors of the Rashtriya Gaushala Trust. The complaints are regarding

mismanagement of the assets of that trust. Pleadings include allegations of felling trees without permission of the Government and other statutory authorities. If any trustee, beneficiary or donor of a public trust has any complaint which could lead to reliefs against the trustees, there are appropriate civil jurisdictions in terms of law to deal with such issues. In the realm of private trusts, the competent authorities as well as the civil courts have jurisdiction. Recourse to the extraordinary writ jurisdiction is uncalled for. It would be inappropriate for the writ court to venture into adjudication as to misfeasance, malfeasance or misconduct in relation to trust property. The domain of Public Interest Litigation cannot be swelled to rope in each and every allegation which could be thrown against any institution or office.

3. Therefore, without prejudice to the Petitioners seeking other remedies in accordance with law, including from any statutory authority having control over trust properties or from authorities which deal with any Government land or property for which Government sanction is required, this writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan)
Chief Justice

Sd/-
(Sharad Kumar Gupta)
Judge