

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17536 of 2018

Manibhushan Pratap Sengar son of Jitendra Kumar Singh, resident of
Mohalla- Premji Colony, Kharaunia Bagicha, P.S.- By Pass, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Urban Development Department, Patna.
4. The Chief Engineer, Road Construction Department, Patna.
5. Bihar Rajya Pool Nirman Nigam, through its Director, Patna.
6. The Chief Executive Officer, Patna Municipal Corporation, Patna.
7. The Project Engineer, Bihar Rajya Pool Nirman Nigam, Patna.
8. The Project Engineer, LPC Project, Patna.
9. The Commissioner, Patna.
10. The District Magistrate, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Manibhushan Pratap Sengar In Person
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Lalit Kishore - Ag

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 30.08.2018 is listed for hearing
for the first time today before the Court.

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

Petitioner has prayed for the following relief:

“(i) An appropriate direction be issued
commanding the Respondents to conduct enquiry
as to whose fault, negligency a portion of Bailey



Road Patna where underpass work and construction of fly over was on as a part of the Lohia path chakra caved in early on Sunday morning.

(ii) An appropriate direction be issued directing the Respondents to reconstruct or repair the Road at the place where the Road got damaged immediately.

(iii) An appropriate direction be issued commanding the respondents to punish the guilty persons for negligent and unaccountable work done causing huge loss of public money as well as to convenience of public in communication/transportation.

(iv) An appropriate direction be issued directing the Respondents to recover the mis utilized money from the guilty persons.

(v) Any other appropriate writ or direction be issued which may be applicable in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

After the matter was heard for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner shall be content if a direction is issued to the concerned respondents to consider and decide the representation, which the petitioner 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 petitioner to take recourse to such alternative remedies as are otherwise available in accordance with law.

We are hopeful that as and when petitioner takes 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)

BT/-

U			
---	--	--	--

