

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18153 of 2016

=====

Mr. Dinesh Kumar Singh, S/o Late Sri Gabga Prasad Singh, Retired Journalist cum Social Worker, Resident of Saristabad, P.O.- G.P.O., P.S.- Gardanibagh, Saristabad, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Principal Secretary, Rural Works Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Chief Engineer, Rural Work Department, Work Division, Lakhisarai.
4. Executive Engineer, Rural Work Department, Works Division, Lakhisarai.
5. Chief Election Officer, Election Commission of India, New Delhi.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Anurag Saurav, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Ajay, G.A.-5

For Election Commission

of India : Mr. Siddhartha Prasad, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 19-04-2017

Grievance of the petitioner in this petition filed *pro bono* is that petitioner is a journalist and Social Worker of Gardanibagh, Saristabad, District- Patna. According to him, Respondent No. 5, the Election Commission of India, during the



period of election for construction and repair of certain roads in the interior parts and rural areas sanctioned funds for construction and repair of the approach road for convenience of the general public to enable them to exercise their franchisee in a proper manner.

2. It is alleged that a sum of Rs. 96,61,000/- was sanctioned towards Lakhisarai Work Division by the Election Commission of India and pointing out misuse in the utilization of these funds and large scale irregularities committed by the authorities, it is stated that the petitioner has submitted a representation to Respondent No. 2 vide Annexure-2 and when nothing was done, this writ petition has been filed.

3. Keeping in view the aforesaid grievance of the petitioner, we direct Respondent No. 2 to consider the representation of the petitioner and take action on the same in accordance with law. That apart, we grant liberty to the petitioner to submit an appropriate complaint in the office of Respondent No. 5 with regard to the allegation made in the writ petition. Respondent No. 5 is requested to look into the complaint of the petitioner and cause for an inquiry as may be permissible under law and in case the allegation of the petitioner is found to be correct, to take correct measures or take action against the erring official. We are hopeful that Respondent No. 5 will look into the matter within a reasonable period.



4. With the aforesaid, the writ petition is disposed of.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Sudhir Singh, J)

P.K.P.

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	28.04.2017
Transmission Date	

