

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 139 OF 2015

Jan Jagruti Grahak Manch Raigad
through its President
Purshotam Vinayak Gokhale.

...Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Others.

..Respondents.

Ms. Anagha Tandel and Medhavi Mathur i/b Vishwakarma & Associates
for the Petitioner.

Ms. P. P. Shinde, for the Respondent-State.

CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE &
N. R. BORKAR, JJ.

Date : October 10, 2022.

P. C. :

1. By the present petition, the grievance is raised about inaction on the part of Respondent-authorities. The Petitioner, an NGO, submitted a representation to Respondent No.3 – the Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Raigad on 29th June 2011 stating that in the year 2008-09, a scheme under the name “Swajaldhara”, was carried out for village Gondhalpasa, taluka Veshavi, Alibaug. The Zilla Parishad made provision of an amount of Rs.69,58,029/-, as financial aid for the said scheme, and the expected amount of public contribution was Rs.7,50,000/-. It is stated in the representation that there were many deficiencies in the implementation of scheme. The record was poorly maintained. Many of the vouchers and receipts were not made available.

patilsr

SACHIN
RAMCHANDRA
PATIL

Digitally signed
by SACHIN
RAMCHANDRA
PATIL
Date:
2022.10.17
14:32:43
+0530

Certain amounts were paid before completion of the work. This act and omission led to the loss of public money. The Respondent-CEO was requested to carry out a transparent enquiry through an expert and to take action against the erring persons.

2. The perusal of documents further shows that certain proceedings were initiated before the Additional Collector at the instance of Yogesh Magar, Charudas Magar and Bhawana Tawade under section 14(g) of the Mumbai Village Panchayats Act, 1958 and the Additional Collector, Raigad vide an order dated 9th July 2013 directed the CEO, ZP, Raigad to conduct a detailed enquiry under sections 58 and 59 of the said Act.

3. Be that as it may, the grievance of the petitioner is that though a detailed representation was made to the respondent- the CEO, Zilla Parishad, Raigad, the same is still pending.

4. We, therefore, deem it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition with direction to Respondent No.3-the CEO, ZP. Raigad to decide the the Petitioner's representation dated 29th June 2011 on its own merits and in accordance with law within twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. Writ petition stands disposed of.

[N. R. Borkar, J.]

[Prasanna B. Varale, J.]