

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

**63 WRIT PETITION NO.8239 OF 2022
MAROTI POCHGONDA GORALE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH SECRETARY
AND OTHERS**

...

**AND
64 WRIT PETITION NO.8240 OF 2022
AAGATRAO VITTHAL SHELAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH SECRETARY
AND OTHERS**

...

**AND
65 WRIT PETITION NO.8241 OF 2022
BAPURAO MAROTRAO PAWAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH SECRETARY
AND OTHERS**

...

**Advocate for the Petitioners : Shri Suryawanshi Govind G.
AGP for the Respondents/ State : Shri P.K. Lakhotiya**

...

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
&
ARUN R. PEDNEKER, JJ.**

DATE :- 11th August, 2022

Per Court :-

1. In all these petitions, the petitioners have put forth an identical prayer clause B, which reads as under :-

“B) By issuing writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or directions, in the like nature, the respondents be directed to decide the proposal dated 21.12.2021 which is pending before the respondent No.4 in respect of getting the grants for the purpose of plantation of trees under the (MRGS) scheme of government.”

2. As the hearing in this matter progressed to some extent, we realized that the National Mission on Sustainable Agriculture (NMSA) and the Sub Mission on Agro Forestry (SMAF), have sanctioned the funds of Rs.335.02 lacs. The petitioners desire that they should be beneficiaries of the said project and they hope to be allocated the said funds. As the Social Forestry Department has not taken a decision, they pray for a writ of mandamus.

3. The High Court should be slow in interjecting with the policy decisions of the State Government and implementation of the policies. The policy matters are best left to the State Government, unless found to be arbitrary.

4. The learned AGP submits that the proposals submitted by the petitioners are hardly any proposals. They lack in material details.

5. The learned advocate for the petitioners adds that

they have planted certain trees like sandalwood, mango, cashew nut, jack-fruit, etc., hoping that they would get the funds from the said scheme.

6. Insofar as Writ Petition No.8240/2022 is concerned, it is stated that a detailed proposal has been tendered, but to the Sarpanch.

7. In view of the above, these Writ Petitions are disposed off.

8. If the petitioners tender proper proposals with required details to the Social Forestry Department, if not already tendered, and if such proposal can be legally entertained by the Department, we leave it to the Department to take an appropriate decision strictly within the framework of the said scheme.

kps (ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.) (RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)