



IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
 AT JABALPUR
 BEFORE
 HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK RUSIA
 &
 HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PRADEEP MITTAL
 ON THE 5th OF JANUARY, 2026

WRIT PETITION No. 47294 of 2025

VIRENDRA PATIL

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Abhinesh Soni - Advocate for petitioner.

Shri Abhijeet Awasthi - Deputy Advocate General for respondent/State.

Reserved on - 18.12.2025

Pronounced on : 05.11.2026

ORDER

Per. Justice Vivek Rusia

By way of present writ petition, the petitioner is seeking following relief:-

- (i). Direct the respondent No.2 to initiate proceedings for recovery of due from the respondent No.2 and 4.
- (ii). direct the respondent no.1 to set up an inquiry as to how Mr. Kuldeep Gupta is issuing royalty slips when his firms (respondent no.3 and 4) have been black listed.
- (iii). direct an inquiry as to why the officials including Respondent no. 2 and Respondent No. 8 have not taken action against the illegal mining and as to why till date the dues of the Government has not been cleared and



under what circumstances and in what capacity Mr. Kuldeep Gupta is involved in the allocation of tenders, excavation of sand and issuance of royalty slips and illegal mining on, ghats other than the 9 ghats which are earmarked for the mining of sand.

(iv) To direct an inquiry as to how the mining has been done below the level of river bed.

2. The petitioner has filed the present writ petition highlighting large-scale illegalities and corruption in the allotment of mining leases. Prior to filing the present petition, the petitioner submitted a representation and also approached this Court by way of Writ Petition No. 8244/2025.

3. According to the petitioner, respondent Nos. 3 to 5 are firms engaged in illegal sand mining and are allegedly acting hand in glove with respondent Nos. 6 and 7, who are government officials. It is further alleged that there is collusion between the mining officers and respondents Nos. 3, 7, and 8 to support the illegal mining activity. The petitioner claims that every year large quantities of sand are being excavated without payment of royalty and that sand mining is also carried out during the ban period, i.e., from 1st July to 3rd September.

4. However, the petitioner has not disclosed his locus standi. It appears that the petitioner is targeting only one Mr. Guldeep Gupta through the present writ petition. The petitioner is not claiming any relief for himself; therefore, the reliefs sought cannot be granted under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. There are competent statutory authorities to examine allegations of corruption and illegal mining. The Mining Act and Rules



constitute a complete code under which the authorities are empowered to control illegal mining by imposing heavy penalties, seizing vehicles, and prosecuting the offenders.

5. Therefore, such issues cannot be entertained in the present writ petition at the instance of a stranger. The writ petition appears to be nothing but an attempt to misuse the process of law to settle a personal score with Mr Gupta, or this appears to be a sponsored litigation.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

(VIVEK RUSIA)
JUDGE

(PRADEEP MITTAL)
JUDGE

Praveen