

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**904 WRIT PETITION NO.965 OF 2021**

**CHARUDATTA WAMANRAO KALWANKAR  
VERSUS  
THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AND OTHERS**

...

Mr.R.S. Pawar, Advocate for the petitioner;  
Mr.B.B. Kulkarni, Advocate for respondent No.1;  
Mrs.M.A. Deshpande, A.G.P. for respondent Nos.2 and 3;  
Mr.D.S. Bagul, Advocate for respondent No.4.

...

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &  
S.G.DIGE, JJ.**

**DATE : 20.04.2022**

**P.C. :**

1. The petitioner claims to be the leader of the opposition in Nandurbar Municipal Council, belonging to a particular National political party. He claims that there is a wide spread corruption in the Municipal Council, to the tune of more than Rs.200 Crores during the period 2005 to 2020.

2. The petitioner has put-forth prayer clauses "A" and "B" as under :-

"A. By way of an appropriate Writ, Order or the direction in the like nature, the Respondent No.1

be directed to inquire into corruption that has taken place in the Nanudrbar Nagar Parishad to the extent of Rs.200 Crores during the period of 2005 to 2020.

B. By way of an appropriate Writ, Order or the direction in the like nature, the Respondent No.2 be directed to handover the inquiry of corruption that has taken place in the Nandurbar Nagar Parishad to the extent of Rs.200 Crores during the period of 2005 to 2020, to the Enforcement Directorate.”

3. It is submitted that the petitioner has not lodged any F.I.R. as regards the said allegations, nor has he taken recourse to section 156(3) of the Cr.P.C. It is further submitted that the petitioner only has the audit report. There was an inquiry conducted earlier by the Principal Secretary, Directorate Municipal Administration, Worli, Mumbai, whose report is dated 10.07.2015.

4. Having gone through the pleadings in the petition, the same are bereft of details and the petitioner has not conducted any research to assist the Court as regards, whether any cause of action exists. Several bald allegations of corruption in the Municipal Council would not convince us to exercise our extra ordinary jurisdiction.

The petitioner is not aware as to whether any inquiry was conducted pursuant to the observations of the Principal Secretary, Municipal Administration dated 10.07.2015. The petitioner has not made any efforts to collect relevant documents or reports of inquiries, if any, to be placed before us. It is purely bald allegations made before us, on the basis of which, the petitioner prays that we should consider prayer clauses "A" and "B". This petition is not in the form of P.I.L. as the petitioner claims that he has filed it in his capacity as being the leader of the opposition in the Municipal Council.

5. Considering the above, this petition is dismissed.

(S.G.DIGE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

SGA