



2026:AHC:26528-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 26 of 2026

Shri Bhagwan and another

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and 3 others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Mangal Rai, Satyendra Pratap Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: Jagdish Pathak (S.C.), Varun Dev Sharma

Chief Justice's Court

HON'BLE ARUN BHANSALI, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE KSHITIJ SHAILENDRA, J.

1. This petition, purportedly in public interest, has been filed by the petitioners seeking constitution of an Inquiry Committee in matter of non-supply of food-grains by Anganbari Karyakatri of Gram Panchayat-Dubari, Vikas Khand-Fatehpur Mandoan, Tehsil-Madhuban, District-Mau.

2. Submissions have been made that the workers at the Anganbari Centre, who are required to supply the food-grains to the beneficiaries, have defalcated and the grain was sold in the open market and has not been supplied to the beneficiaries and therefore, action be initiated against them. Based on the complaint made by the petitioners, an inquiry was undertaken by the District Programme Officer, District-Mau, who came to the conclusion that the allegations made were factually incorrect and the petitioner No. 1-Bhagwan is son-in-law of Smt. Shanti Devi, one of the Anganbari Karyakatri, who is having matrimonial dispute with his wife, i.e., daughter of Smt. Shant Devi and, on account of such dispute, has been making false complaints against his mother-in-law and other Anganbari Karyakatri. Indications have also been made that the petitioner is not even a resident of the said village.

3. Counsel for the petitioners attempted to make submissions that as the facts have come to the knowledge of the petitioner, he, along with petitioner No. 2, has made complaints with regard to the wrongdoing and therefore, the same requires investigation.

4. Having considered the submissions made, as there is no denial of the fact that both the petitioners do not belong to the village in question and the source of information and the basis/reasons for making of the complaints have not been disclosed, further the fact that the petitioner No. 1 is having matrimonial dispute with daughter of one of the Anganbari Karyakatri is also not disputed, we do not find that the present petition is *bona fide*.

5. The petition has no substance, the same is, therefore, dismissed.

(Kshitij Shailendra,J.) (Arun Bhansali,CJ.)

February 6, 2026

Mukesh Pal/Sazia