

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.505 OF 2020

Santosh s/o Baliram Pawade

..VS..

The State of Maharashtra, through its Secretary Department Food, Civil Supplies and
Consumer Protection, Mantralaya, Mumbai 32 and others

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri N. S. Khandewale, Counsel for the petitioner.
Smt. K. R. Deshpande, Addl. P. P. for the respondent nos.1 to 5.

CORAM : SUNIL B. SHUKRE AND
AVINASH G. GHAROTE, JJ.

DATED : 20/10/2020

Heard Shri Khandewale, learned Counsel for
the petitioner.

By this petition, the petitioner has prayed for
direction to the police Authorities for registration of the
FIR for various offences including the offence of cheating
against the respondent nos. 6 to 11 on the ground that
these respondents, in spite of earning handsome income
annually, which is much more than annual income of
Rs.44,000/-, have received food grains under a
Government scheme, called Priority Household Scheme.

The maximum income fixed for conferring benefits to the poor persons under the priority household scheme floated under the provisions of The National Food Security Act, 2013 and The Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006.

It is submitted that the respondents being not poor, were not at all entitled to receive such benefits.

The petitioner claims to be a social worker interested in social cause. The petitioner has obtained certain documents in proof of his contentions regards income earned by some respondents out of the respondent nos. 6 to 11. These respondents belong to village Bibi and village Nanda. The petitioner, who is espousing a public cause, however, has not elicited any information about the entire village populace so that all of the wrong doors can be brought to book and it appears that the petitioner has only targeted members of one family. Obviously, the cause being canvassed through this petition appears to be private one and not public and therefore, this petition deserves to be

(3)

1.wp.505.2020

dismissed on the ground of questionable agenda of the petitioner.

The writ petition stands dismissed with costs of ₹ 1000/- (₹ one thousand).

JUDGE

JUDGE

Sarkate