

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14094 of 2022

Kaushal Kaushik Son of Late Jagdish Prasad, resident of village - Nisarpura,
P.O. Amarpura, P.S. Naubatpur, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, JEEVIKA, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Nalanda at Biharsharif.
6. The District Magistrate, Gaya.
7. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad.
8. The District Magistrate, Jehanabad.
9. The District Magistrate, Arwal.
10. The District Magistrate, Nawada.
11. The District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram.
12. The District Magistrate, Bhojpur at Ara.
13. The District Magistrate, Buxar.
14. The District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur.
15. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi.
16. The District Magistrate, Vaishali at Hajipur.
17. The District Magistrate, Sheohar.
18. The District Magistrate, West Champaran at Bettiah.
19. The District Magistrate, Saran at Chapra.
20. The District Magistrate, Siwan.
21. The District Magistrate, Gopalganj.
22. The District Magistrate, East Champaran at Motihari.
23. The District Magistrate, Darbhanga.
24. The District Magistrate, Samastipur.
25. The District Magistrate, Saharsa.
26. The District Magistrate, Supaul.



27. The District Magistrate, Purnea.
28. The District Magistrate, Araria.
29. The District Magistrate, Kishanganj.
30. The District Magistrate, Katihar.
31. The District Magistrate, Madhubani.
32. The District Magistrate, Madhepura.
33. The District Magistrate, Bhagalpur.
34. The District Magistrate, Banka.
35. The District Magistrate, Munger.
36. The District Magistrate, Jamui.
37. The District Magistrate, Lakhisarai.
38. The District Magistrate, Sheikhpura.
39. The District Magistrate, Khagaria.
40. The District Magistrate, Begusarai.

... .. 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.Awnish Kumar, Adv
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Anjani Kumar (AAG4)

=====

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

Date : 23-09-2022

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

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

- (I) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of
CERTIORARI , for quashing the letter dated 05.07.2022



and contained in his memo no.1056715 dated 05.07.2022, whereby and where under the Respondent no.2 has been pleased to direct the Respondent no.3 to 40 to associate to the members of village organization of JEEVIKA for providing technical assistance to the beneficiaries under Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (Gramin) in the Gram Panchayats where the post of Gramin Awas Sahayak is vacant for the purposes of registration of beneficiaries on Awas Soft, Geo Tagging of the beneficiaries on the Awas App as also other related works in connection with the selection and construction of houses under the said scheme.

II) For a declaration that if the appointment of Awas Sahayak by the resolution of the State Government dated 03.10.2013 was intended to provide:

(a) To cooperate the Block Development Officer for the purposes of selection of beneficiaries according to the target;

(b) To bring awareness amongst the beneficiaries regarding selection under the scheme;

(c) To cooperate the beneficiaries for opening of their account in the Bank;

(d) To cooperate the beneficiaries for their photography and preparation of affidavit;

(e) To cooperate for distribution of Pass Book;

(f) For regular monitoring of progress in construction of the houses through the regular movement in the area;

(g) To take photography of under construction and constructed houses under the scheme;

(h) To identify the beneficiaries, who did not construct their houses within time;

(i) To complete the construction of houses;

(j) To get the houses completely constructed;

(k) To submit a report regarding completion of construction and for compliance of instruction issued by the Block Development Officer time to time;

The Respondent no.2 is justified to entrust those works to the members of village organization of JEEVIKA when for the purposes of selection for appointment as Gramin Awas Sahayak, the minimum qualification was Intermediate or equivalent qualification from any recognized Board or Institution in which the preference was given to the candidates having passed his Intermediate Examination with mathematics.

III) For issuance of any other appropriate writ/writs, order / orders, direction/directions for which the writ petitioner shall be found entitled under the facts and circumstances



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. 2, **The Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna**, 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 four 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 on 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 four months from the date of its filing along with a copy of this order;

(c) The order assigning reasons shall be communicated to the petitioner;

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

(e) Also, opportunity to place on record all relevant materials/documents shall be granted to the parties;

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

(g) 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;

(h) 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;

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

The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

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

