

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15063 of 2014

- =====
1. Akash Kumar Son of Sri Ram Pravesh Singh resident of village- Dakara,
Police Station- Ramgarh Chauk, District- Lakhisarai
2. Subodh Kumar son of Sri Dinesh Singh resident of village- Dakara,
Police Station- Ramgarh Chauk, District- Lakhisarai

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Bihar,
Patna
3. The District Magistrate Lakhisarai, District- Lakhisarai
4. The District Programme Coordinator, Lakhisarai, District- Lakhisarai
5. The District Development Officer, Lakhisarai, District- Lakhisarai
6. The Sub divisional Officer, Lakhisarai, District- Lakhisarai
7. The Programme Officer, Ramgarh Chouk Block, Gram Panchayat,
Aure, Police station- Ramgarh Chouk, District- Lakhisarai
8. The Block Development Officer, Ramgarh Chauk, Police Station-
Ramgarh Chauk, District- Lakhisarai
9. Mukhiya Aure Gram Panchayat Block Ramgarh Chauk, Police station-
Ramgarh Chouk, District- Lakhisarai
10. Panchayat Rojgar Sevak Aure Gram Panchayat, Police station-
Ramgarh Chouk, District- Lakhisarai

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ram Sevak Choudhary
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Aag-6 Anjani Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

2 04-05-2015 The petitioners claim to be the social activists. They filed this writ petition with a prayer to direct the respondents to cause investigation into the working of the Mahatama Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee scheme (MANREGA) in the State of Bihar, and to punish the persons who are found guilty. The

petitioners contend that serious irregularities have been committed in the context of maintaining list of persons who receive the amount that has been spent under the scheme. Various details in this behalf, which are said to have been obtained by filing applications under the Right to Information Act, are stated.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the State.

If one closely examines the scheme under the Act, it becomes clear that hardly there is any audit worth its name though thousands of crores of money is spent by Government on the scheme. It is only the so called social audit that takes care of it. Virtually all the irregularities are given a whitewash. Hue and cry raised by the farmers about the adverse impact of the scheme has unfortunately fallen to deaf ears. The curious part of it is that every possible care is taken to ensure that no asset building takes place through the work force on the expenditure of such amount. When this is the scenario, the petitioners cannot have the luxury to put pressure on the Government to work out the scheme in a transparent manner. We do not find any material or basis to entertain the writ application. The reason is that the Court cannot reframe the scheme.

The writ petition is dismissed.

(L. Narasimha Reddy,CJ)

B.KRoy/-

(Sudhir Singh, J)

U			
---	--	--	--