



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

8 WRIT PETITION NO. 10319 OF 2025

**SAHEBRAO SHANKARRAO BELE
VERSUS
THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR NANADED AND OTHERS**

.....

Mr. V. B. Kulkarni, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr. R. S. Wani, AGP for the Respondent/State
Mr. S. B. Pulkundwar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

**CORAM: SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 1st DECEMBER, 2025

P. C. :-

1. Present petition has been filed for directions to Respondent No.3-Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Kandhar, District Nanded to enquire in the complaint filed by the Petitioner in view of communication dated 15.04.2025 sent by him to Deputy CEO-cum-Deputy District Co-Ordinator MREGS Zilla Parishad, Nanded.

2. Heard learned Advocate appearing for the Petitioner. Learned AGP waives notice for Respondent No.1. Learned Advocate Mr. Pulkundwar waives notice for Respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

3. The Petitioner contends that he is a journalist and while doing research in journalism he came across many illegalities in the work done under the Employment Guarantee Scheme in the Nanded district. It was found that under MREGS scheme, specially the relatives of the Sarpanch who were not labour were shown as labours and huge bills have been drawn in their names. Even JCB like machine was engaged, but it is shown that the work has been got done through the labours and therefore, he had made the said complaint.

4. Along with the complaint, the present Petitioner has not given any document. Learned Advocate for the Petitioner tried to submit that in fact his complaint is of more than 200 pages. Deputy CEO has given direction to respondent No.3 to make the inquiry by letter dated 15.04.2025. However, no report has been submitted and therefore, the Petitioner had given reminder letter dated 06.05.2025.

5. Taking into consideration the reminder it appears that the Petitioner had made up the mind that offence has been committed. Under such circumstance, where is the question of any

inquiry. Furthermore when the letter has been issued or directions have been given by letter dated 15.04.2025 to respondent No.3, then respondent No.3 is duty bound to comply with the orders or directions given by the Superior. There is no question of issuing any writ, when the Petitioner has failed to produce any document on record which would support his contention.

6. In view of this, Writ Petition stands disposed of.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

ssp