

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.696 of 2020**

Sanjay Singh, President Bish Sutri Yojna Ward No.12, aged about 51 years, male, Son of Shaileshwar Singh, Resident of Ward 12, Singhia 1, Singhia, District- Samastipur, Bihar- 848209

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through District Magistrate, Samastipur.
2. Block Development Officer, Singhia Samastipur.
3. Presiding Officer, Under Right to Information Act, Singhia, Samastipur.
4. Circle Officer, Singhia, Samastipur.

... .. Respondents

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner : Ms. Archana Sinha @ Archana Shahi, Advocate  
For the Respondents : Mr. Kumar Alok SC 7

**CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**

**And**

**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY**

**ORAL ORDER**

**(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)**

2      13-01-2020

Petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:-

*“a) For directing the respondents to provide the details of work allotment and details of expenses in completion of work under MANREGA in Panchayat Singhia, Samastipur for the period 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019.*

*b) For directing the respondents to provide the details that by which order (year wise) the work of MANREGA was granted to whom, what work has been done, and what amount has been withdrawn against which work in which year from the Government account. And also to file measurement book/master roll before this Hon’ble Court for proving completion of work.*

*c) For directing the respondents to hold an enquiry and subsequently punish the responsible personal who all were involved in MANREGA and withdrawn Government fund without doing any work.*



*d) For any other consequential relief/reliefs for which the petitioner may be found entitled.”*

Save and except for making bald averments unsubstantiated by any fact, the present petition stands filed, in public interest.

We are of the considered view that the present petition is totally misconceived in law. The petitioner has not approached the authorities before filing the present petition.

The law with regard to public interest litigation is settled and clear in **D. N. Jeevaraj Vs. Chief Secretary, Government of Karnataka & Ors, (2016) 2 SCC 653**, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court in paragraphs 34 to 38 observed as under:-

*“34. The learned counsel for the parties addressed us on the question of the bona fides of Nagalaxmi Bai in filing a public interest litigation. We leave this question open and do not express any opinion on the correctness or otherwise of the decision of the High Court in this regard.*

*35. However, we note that generally speaking, procedural technicalities ought to take a back seat in public interest litigation. This Court held in Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of U.P. [Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of U.P., 1989 Supp (1) SCC 504] to this effect as follows: (SCC p. 515, para 16)*

*“16. The writ petitions before us are not inter partes disputes and have been raised by way of public interest litigation and the controversy before the court is as to whether for social safety and for creating a*



*hazardless environment for the people to live in, mining in the area should be permitted or stopped. We may not be taken to have said that for public interest litigations, procedural laws do not apply. At the same time it has to be remembered that every technicality in the procedural law is not available as a defence when a matter of grave public importance is for consideration before the court.”*

*36. A considerable amount has been said about public interest litigation in R&M Trust [R&M Trust v. Koramangala Residents Vigilance Group, (2005) 3 SCC 91] and it is not necessary for us to dwell any further on this except to say that in issues pertaining to good governance, the courts ought to be somewhat more liberal in entertaining public interest litigation. However, in matters that may not be of moment or a litigation essentially directed against one organisation or individual (such as the present litigation which was directed only against Sadananda Gowda and later Jeevaraj was impleaded) ought not to be entertained or should be rarely entertained. Other remedies are also available to public spirited litigants and they should be encouraged to avail of such remedies.*

*37. In such cases, that might not strictly fall in the category of public interest litigation and for which other remedies are available, insofar as the issuance of a writ of mandamus is concerned, this Court held in Union of India v. S.B. Vohra [Union of India v. S.B. Vohra, (2004) 2 SCC 150 : 2004 SCC (L&S) 363] that: (SCC p. 160, paras 12-13)*

*“12. Mandamus literally means a command. The essence of mandamus in England was that it was a royal command issued by the King's Bench (now Queen's Bench) directing performance of a public legal duty.*

*13. A writ of mandamus is issued in favour of a person who establishes a legal right in himself. A writ of mandamus is issued against a person who has a legal duty*



*to perform but has failed and/or neglected to do so. Such a legal duty emanates from either in discharge of a public duty or by operation of law. The writ of mandamus is of a most extensive remedial nature. The object of mandamus is to prevent disorder from a failure of justice and is required to be granted in all cases where law has established no specific remedy and whether justice despite demanded has not been granted.”*

38. *A salutary principle or a well-recognised rule that needs to be kept in mind before issuing a writ of mandamus was stated in Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. v. Union of India [Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. v. Union of India, (1974) 2 SCC 630] in the following words: (SCC pp. 641-42, paras 24-25)*

*“24. ... The powers of the High Court under Article 226 are not strictly confined to the limits to which proceedings for prerogative writs are subject in English practice. Nevertheless, the well-recognised rule that no writ or order in the nature of a mandamus would issue when there is no failure to perform a mandatory duty applies in this country as well. Even in cases of alleged breaches of mandatory duties, the salutary general rule, which is subject to certain exceptions, applied by us, as it is in England, when a writ of mandamus is asked for, could be stated as we find it set out in Halsbury's Laws of England (3rd Edn.), Vol. 11, p. 106:*

*‘198. Demand for performance must precede application.—As a general rule the order will not be granted unless the party complained of has known what it was he was required to do, so that he had the means of considering whether or not he should comply, and it must be shown by evidence that there was a distinct demand of that which the party seeking the mandamus desires to enforce, and that that demand was*



*met by a refusal.'*

*25. In the cases before us there was no such demand or refusal. Thus, no ground whatsoever is shown here for the issue of any writ, order, or direction under Article 226 of the Constitution."*

As such we dismiss the writ petition reserving liberty to the petitioner to initiate appropriate proceedings, if so desired, and in accordance with law.

**(Sanjay Karol, CJ)**

**( Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)**

BT/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

