

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19787 of 2018

-
1. Ajay Kumar Son of Janakdhari Prasad
 2. Mithilesh Kumar Son of Siya Saran Prasad
 3. Ranjeet Kumar Son of Badri Prasad
 4. Dinanath Prasad Son of Shyam Sundar Prasad
- All are the resident of village-Chandaura, P.S.-Chabilapur, District-Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Panchayat Raj, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Panchaity Raj Govt. of Bihar, patna, Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Nalanda.
4. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Nalanda.
5. The District panchaity Raj officer, Nalanda.
6. The Block Development officer, Prakhand Rajgir, Distt-Nalanda.
7. Anuj Kumar Son of-----, presently posted as Mukhiya under Gram panchayat Raj Pathraura, prakhand Rajgir, Distt-Nalanda.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Swapnil Kumar Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr.P.N.Shahi -Aag6

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

2 06-01-2020 The petition filed on 03.10.2018 is listed for hearing
for the first time today before the Court.

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

Petitioners have prayed for the following relief:

“For a direction to the respondent concern to conduct



an enquiry with regard to financial irregularities committed by the Mukhiya of the Gram Panchayat Raj, Pathroua, Block-Rajgir, District- Nalanda with regard to different beneficial scheme runs by the respondent State through the Gram Panchayat such as Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana, Jal Nal Yojana, Chief Minister Seven Nishchay Yojana, Scheme under Manrega in which gross irregularities have been committed and huge public money have been misappropriated in connivance with Government officials and even said Mkhya has been arrested in trap case for which vigilance case no. 34/2018 has been instituted against him and despite having prima facie evidence against the said private respondent no. 7 and having apprised about the same to all the concern respondent no action has been taken as yet and further for any other appropriate relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled in the facts and circumstances of this case.”

After the matter was heard for some time, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners shall be content if a direction is issued to the concerned respondents to consider and decide the representation, which the petitioners shall be making afresh within a period of four weeks from today.

Learned counsel for the State states that upon receipt of such request, if any, the same shall be dealt with in accordance with law, expeditiously and positively within a



period of three months from the date of receipt thereof.

Equally, liberty is reserved to the petitioners to take recourse to such alternative remedies as are otherwise available in accordance with law.

We are hopeful that as and when petitioners take recourse to such remedies, as are otherwise available in law, before the appropriate forum, the same shall be dealt with, in accordance with law and with reasonable dispatch.

The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

sujit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

