

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11568 of 2021

Ujjawal Kumar, Social Worker Son of Ram Suresh Prasad, Aadhar No. 419734341292, Village-Bishunpura, Post-Bishunpura Cherki, P.S. Sherghati, District-Gaya, Bihar, PIN Code No. 824237.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Cabinet Secretariat Department, Government of Bihar Main Secretariat, Patna, 800015, with e-mail ID-secy_cabsec (at) bih.gov.in
2. The Chief Secretary, Cabinet Secretariat Department, Government of Bihar Main Secretariat, Patna-800015.
3. The Principal Secretary, Cabinet Secretariat Department, Government of India, Main Secretariat, Patna-800015.
4. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. The Director Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
7. The Special Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
8. The Additional Secretary cum CEO BBOSE, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
9. The Regional Deputy Director Magadh Commissioner, Gaya, Bihar.
10. The Commissioner, Magadh Commissioner Gaya, Bihar.
11. The District Magistrate, Gaya, Bihar.
12. The District Education Officer, Gaya, Bihar.
13. The District Programme Officer (SSA), Gaya, Bihar.
14. The Sub-Divisional Officer (SDO), Sherghatti, Gaya, Bihar.
15. The Block Development Officer, Sherghatty, Gaya, Bihar.
16. The Block Education Officer, Sherghatty Block, District-Gaya, Bihar.
17. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Gaya, Bihar.
18. The Deputy Collector Land Reforms (DCLR), Sherghati, Gaya.
19. The Additional District Magistrate (Public Grievances Redressal), Gaya, Bihar.
20. The Headmaster/Government Middle School Bishunpura, Sherghatti, Gaya, Bihar, through the Director Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
21. The Bihar State Education Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited through its Managing Director, Shri Sanjay Kumar Singh Indian

administration Service. Acharya Shivpujan Sahay Path, Bihar Rashtrabhasha Parishad Campus, Shiksha Bhawan, Salimpur Ahra, Patna Bihar 80004, Email-infor@bseidc.in

22. The Managing Director, the Bihar State Education Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited E-mail-bseidc@gmail.com
23. The General Manager (administration) the Bihar State Education Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited.
24. The Seniro Architect, Mr. Pankaj Sinha, The Bihar State Educational Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited.
25. The Executive Engineer, Magadh Commissioner, the Bihar State Educational Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited. E-mail-binodranjan73@gmail.com
26. The Bihar Educational Project Council through its General Council Shiksha Bhawan Rashtrabhasha Parishad Campus, Saidpur, Rajendra Nagar, Patna, E-mail-ssabihar@gmail.com
27. The State Implementing Society (SIS), the Bihar Educational Project Council Patna, Bihar.
28. The State Level Officer, Headed by State Project Director, Shiksha Bhawan Rashtrabhasha Parishad Campus, Saidpur, Rajendra Nagar, Patna.
29. The District Executive Committed Headed by the District Magistrate, the Bihar Educational Project Council District-Gaya, Shiksha Bhawan, Gaya, Bihar.
30. The District Level Office (D.L.O.) through the District Magistrate, Gaya, the Bihar Educational Project Council District-Gaya, Shiksha Bhawan, Gaya, Bihar.
31. The Block Level Office, Block Resource Centre Sherghatti Gaya through Block Educational Officer Sherghatti, Gaya, Bihar.
32. The Secretary/Incharge of Cluster Resource Centre (LRC) Mr. Dinesh Kumar Nirala, Male, aged about not known, Assistant Teacher, Bishunpura, Government of Middle School, Sherghatti, Gaya, Bihar.
33. The Chairman, School Education Committee, Mrs. Chanchala (Chulbuliya) Devi Ward Member, Ward no. VI, Cherki.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Manish Kumar No 13, Adv
For the Respondent/s	:	Mrs.Shilpa Singh (GA12) Mr. Girjesh Kumar, Adv

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR)

**(The proceedings of the Court are being conducted through
Video Conferencing and the Advocates joined the proceedings**

through Video Conferencing from their residence.)

Date : 02-08-2021

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner has prayed for the following relief(s):-

“ That the present writ application is being filed in the nature of Public Interest Litigation on behalf of the petitioner above named praying interalia the following relief:

i. For issuance of a direction/directions, order/orders, including writ in the nature of mandamus commanding the concerned respondent authorities to take appropriate steps for up-gradation of Government Middle School (राजकीय मध्यम विद्यालय) Bishunpura Sherghatti (Gaya) to Secondary School (USS) Class of IX whereby and whereunder all the rules and requirement of up-gradation is fulfill by the said school. However, education department Government of Bihar has ordered action to all district that every panchayat should have at least one high school.”

The Hon’ble Supreme Court in *D. N. Jeevaraj Vs.*

Chief Secretary, Government of Karnataka & Ors, (2016) 2

SCC 653, 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 parties 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.”

After the matter was heard for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner, under instructions, states that petitioner shall be content if a direction is issued to the authority concerned i.e. respondent no. 12 (District Education Officer, Gaya) to consider and decide the representation which the petitioner shall be filing within a period of four weeks from today for redressal of the grievance(s).

Learned counsel for the respondents states that if such a representation is filed by the petitioner, the authority concerned shall consider and dispose it of expeditiously and preferably within a period of three months from the date of its filing along with a copy of this order.

Statement accepted and taken on record.

As such, petition stands disposed of in the following terms:-

(a) Petitioner shall approach the authority concerned within a period of four weeks from today by filing a representation for redressal of the grievance(s);

(b) The authority concerned shall consider and dispose it of expeditiously by a reasoned and speaking order preferably within a period of three months from the date of its filing along with a copy of this order;

(c) Needless to add, while considering such representation, principles of natural justice shall be followed and due opportunity of hearing afforded to the parties;

(d) Equally, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to take recourse to such alternative remedies as are otherwise available in accordance with law;

(e) 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;

(f) Liberty reserved to the petitioner to approach the Court, if the need so arises subsequently on the same and subsequent cause of action;

(g) Liberty also reserved to the petitioner to make a mention for listing of the petition on priority basis. As and when any such mention is made, Registry shall take steps for listing the petition at the earliest.

(h) We have not expressed any opinion on merits.
All issues are left open;

(i) The proceedings, during the time of current Pandemic- Covid-19 shall be conducted through digital mode, unless the parties otherwise mutually agree to meet in person i.e. physical mode;

The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

Interlocutory Application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(S. Kumar, J)

Sanjay/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	05.08.2021
Transmission Date	NA