

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13081 of 2022

=====

Dinesh Prasad Pita - Sri Vishundeo Prasad, Gram- Varsiyamba P.O. -
Salehpur, Thana - Telhara, Jila - Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Bihar Rajya Dwara Jila Padadhikari, Nalanda.
2. Ayukt Avem Sachiv Sah-Bhumi Sudhar Ayukt, Bihar Sarkar, Patna.
3. Pradhan Sachiv, Pasupalan avem Matasya Vibhag, Bihar Sarkar.
4. Nideshak, Pashupalan avem Matasya Vibhag, Bihar, Sarkar, Patna.
5. Jila Matasya Padadhikari Sah Mukhya Karyapalak Padadhikari, Nalanda,
Bihar-Sharif.
6. Anchandhikari, Ekangarsarai.
7. Sri Janardan Prasad, Mantri Ekangsarai, Jila- Nalanda.
8. Lok Sikayat Nivaran Padadhikari, Hilsa, Nalanda.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

(The proceedings of the Court are being conducted by Hon'ble the Chief Justice /Hon'ble Judges through Video Conferencing from their residential offices/residences. Also, the Advocates and the Staffs joined the proceedings through Video Conferencing from their residences /offices.)

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Indradeo Prasad, Adv
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Md. Khurshid Alam (AAG 12)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR)

Date : 09-09-2022

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

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

प्रार्थना

- (ii) जिला नगरपालिका पदाधिकारी - 88 - मुख्य कार्यालय पदाधिकारी, नालन्दा, बिहार-शरीफ का पत्रांक - 422, नगरपालिका, बिहार-शरीफ, दिनांक - 27.05.2022 को खद किया जाय, जिसके द्वारा एक्कांरसराय, अंचल स्थित बरसियायों जलकर में जल निकासी पर प्रतिक्रिया लगाई गयी है।
- (ii) तदनुसार, एक्कांरसराय अंचल स्थित बरसियायों पोखर, निरायन थाना नं० - 119, खाता नं० - 217, प्लॉट नं० पुराना - 560, नया - 299, स्वचा - 18 एकड़ 60 डेसिमिल, किरम सर्वसाधारण आम में लोगों को पानी जमा करने एवम् उसके पानी का उपयोग भित्ति में करने के लिए स्वतंत्र करने का आदेश पारित किया जाय तथा उसे जलकर बैरात पंजी से गुप्त किया जाय।
- (iii) कोई अन्य आदेश/निर्देश जो जनहित/ राष्ट्रहित/ विधित्त एवं न्यायहित के लिए उचित हो, उसे पारित किया जाए।

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)**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 respondent **no.4, Director, Department of Fisheries and Animal Husbandry, Govt. of Bihar, Patna,** to consider and decide the appeal which the petitioner has filed vide Annexure-5

to this writ petition.

In view of the above, the authority concerned is directed to decide the appeal of petitioner expeditiously and preferably within a period of 3 months.

The order assigning reasons shall be communicated to the petitioner;

Liberty reserved to the petitioner to approach the appropriate forum/Court, should the need so arise subsequently on the same and subsequent cause of action;

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

Accordingly, the petition stands disposed.

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

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(S. Kumar, J)

ranjan/-

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