

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20176 of 2021

=====

Rajendra Mandal Son of Late Chhedi Mandal Resident of Village -
Bhabhanpura Tola, Ward No. 09, Amanat Hedaetullah Subedar, Under Gram
Panchayat Chirori, Block and P.S. Chausa District- Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Vice Chairman of Bihar State Disaster Management Authority (BSDMA), having his Office, 2nd Floor, Pant Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna, Bihar - 800001.
2. The Member of Bihar State Disaster Management Authority (BSDMA), having his Office, 2nd Floor, Pant Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna, Bihar - 800001.
3. Senior Editor, Bihar State Disaster Management Authority (BSDMA), having his Office, 2nd Floor, Pant Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna, Bihar - 800001.
4. Project Officer, Human Induced Disaster, having his Office, 2nd Floor, Pant Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna, Bihar - 800001.
5. The Divisional Commissioner Koshi Division, Saharsa.
6. The District Magistrate Cum Collector, Madhepura.
7. The D.D.C. (District Development Committee), Madhepura.
8. The A.D.M. (Additional District Magistrate), Madhepura.
9. The S.D.O., Udakishunganj, District- Madhepura.
10. The B.D.O., Chausa, District- Madhepura.
11. The Circle Officer, Chausa, District- Madhepura.
12. Mukhiya, Under Gram Panchayat Chirauri, Block Chausa, District- Madhepura.
13. Ward Member, of Under Gram Panchayat Chirauri, Block - Chausa, District- Madhepura.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shekhar Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Md. Khurshid Alam (Aag12)

=====

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 : 07-01-2022

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

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

- i. For issuance of writ/writs , order/orders, direction/directions in the nature of Public Interest Litigation for direction upon the respondents to inquire into the matter through the enquiry committee during the compensation Disbursement Distribution scam in Flood Relief Money Distribution in the Rural Area, a big scam has flood effected people are now suffering with relief material scam the State Government has incur raise the loss of beneficiary damage mainly for this flood affected area and during the money distribution there is a large number scale irregularities were committed by the Concerned Respondents

including the Ward Member of Under Gram Panchayat Chirauri, Bhabhanpura Tola, Ward No. 9 and in other ward there is serious defalcation of the Government Money which is committed by the Mukhiya as well as the Ward Member of Under Gram Panchayat Chausa District-Madhepur, And a list of fake persons , they are not belongs to inhabitant of Under Gram Panchayat Chirori they have got the benefit of Compensation with the help of Ward Member and Mukhiya.

- ii. For further prayed for direction upon the Respondents to call for the report regarding the list of beneficiary Flood Relief Compensation Disbursement Distribution under gram Panchayat Chirauri , Bhabhanpura Tola, Under Block

Chausa, District- Madhepura , So that to submit the report regarding the list of beneficiary, because in the aforesaid list the name of Fake Persons have been appeared handling the flood relief fund, which carried out probe into the scam reported irregularities of said fund and altogether 335 (Three Hundred thirty Five) beneficiaries, they have received the Compensation Disbursement Distribution amount illegally at serial no. 270,271, 240 241, 242, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, and 304, while they have non-deserving for getting the Compensation Distribution Amount. The name of the said persons has not appeared in the B.P.L. Ration Card List issued by the Government to household who are living

Below Poverty Line and their family income is less than Rs. 24,000/- per annum. But they have got the benefit of flood relief, and the original deserving beneficiaries their name have been appeared in the B.P.L Ration Card List, they have not received the Flood Relief Distribution Amount.

- iii. For further direction upon the Respondents after proper enquiry in the Flood Relief Compensation Disbursement Distribution amount, if found taken to be true then in such circumstances a direction has been issued to concerned Respondent to immediately institute the criminal case against the responsible persons, who committed the misappropriation in Government Money.

iv. For further any other relief/ reliefs,
order/orders, direction/ directions may
deem fit and proper in the fact and
circumstances of this case.

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, respondent no.6, the District Magistrate Cum Collector, Madhepura or any of the statutory authority 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 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 four 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	12.01.2022
Transmission Date	NA