



1

WP-35249-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH

ON THE 29th OF SEPTEMBER, 2026WRIT PETITION No. 35249 of 2026

CNR No.: MPHC010622792026

*LALARAM SINGH**Versus**THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS*

.....
Appearance:

Shri Surya Kumar Patel - Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Vijayendra Singh Choudhary - Government Advocate for the respondents/State.

.....

ORDER

The instant writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed by the petitioner against the inaction on the part of the respondent No.3 in not considering the representation submitted by him alleging certain irregularities and illegalities on the part of respondent No.5, who is stated to be working as Assistant Block Manager/Assistant Livelihood Manager in the concerned Panchayat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an elected member of the concerned Janpad Panchayat and has submitted various representations raising allegations regarding the functioning of respondent No.5, including allegations relating to removal of members of Self Help Groups, financial irregularities and misappropriation of public



funds. It is further submitted that respondent No.5 was transferred to Block Shahnagar, but has continued to remain at Block Ajaygarh and his uncle is also posted in the same Panchayat as Mission Officer. According to the petitioner, despite repeated representations, no action has been taken by the competent authority. Hence, this petition.

3. Per contra, learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents/State submits that the petitioner has no locus standi to maintain the present petition. It is submitted that the petitioner has not disclosed infringement of any of his personal or legally enforceable rights. It is further submitted that the grievances raised by the petitioner essentially concern the service posting and functioning of respondent No.5 and alleged irregularities in implementation of Government schemes, which do not confer upon the petitioner an independent cause of action so as to invoke the writ jurisdiction of this Court. Thus, the petition deserves to be dismissed.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. It is a well settled principle of law that a writ of mandamus ordinarily lies for enforcement of a legal right and corresponding public/statutory duty. The petitioner is required to establish that he has a legally enforceable right in respect of which a corresponding duty is cast upon the respondent authority. In the present case, the petitioner has not demonstrated any enforceable legal right of his own which has been infringed by the alleged inaction on the part of the respondents. The fact that the petitioner is an elected member of the Janpad Panchayat and has submitted representations regarding the functioning of an employee does not,



3

WP-35249-2026

by itself, confer a right upon him to seek a writ of mandamus for initiating departmental action against such employee.

6. Accordingly, no case is made out warranting interference.

7. The petition being devoid of merits and substance is hereby dismissed.

(VIVEK KUMAR SINGH)
JUDGE

Shanu