

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

39 WRIT PETITION NO.14660 OF 2023

**YOGENDRA KASHINATH DORKAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA
THROUGH CHIEF SECRETARY AND OTHERS**

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Shah Jayant Ramanlal
GP for Respondents State: Mr. A. B. Girase

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.

DATE : 4th December, 2023

ORDER:

1. This is yet another example of an attempt to use the Writ of Mandamus for the purpose of making allegations against the revenue authorities and branding them as being corrupt, without any substantiated information.

2. The Petitioner claims to be the Editor of a newspaper- Dainik Uttar Maharashtra. He also claims to be a whistle-blower and takes the credit of filing several complaints against the Respondents, alleging incidents of embezzlement of public funds and corruption.

3. In the present case, his contention is that Respondent No. 7 is a corrupt official and he indulged in corruption during his tenure as a District Collector, Nandurbar. Complaints have been filed with the Chief Secretary, Principal Secretary- Home Department, Principal Secretary-

Public Health Department, Director General of Police, Anti Corruption Bureau and Divisional Commissioner. It is further alleged that Rs.20 crores funds were received from NITI Aayog, Mazgaon Dockyard Ltd. and Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd. for dealing with the Covid pandemic and Respondent No.7 has embezzled public funds while procuring medical equipment/instruments at an exorbitant price. It is also contended that because Respondent No.7 has purchased an immovable property, he is a corrupt official.

4. This petition is not in the nature of PIL. So also, a personal legal injury has not been caused to the Petitioner. The Petitioner does not want this to be considered as a PIL.

5. In view of the above, we do not deem it appropriate to entertain such Writ Petition wherein wild and reckless allegations have been made against a revenue authority and we do not find any material before us by which we could even entertain this petition as a PIL. The Petitioner claims that he has been filing complaints against the Respondents. Baseless complaints ought not to be entertained.

6. In view of the above, **this Petition is dismissed.**

(Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)