

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5817 of 2023

=====

Pankaj Kumar Singh, male, aged about 36 years, Son of Ashok Kumar Singh, resident of village- Rasalpur Dakshin Tola, P.O. Manpur, P.S. Gaya Muffasil, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Gaya, District - Gaya.
4. The District Panchayat Raj Officer, Gaya, District- Gaya.
5. The Block Development Officer, Manpur, District - Gaya.
6. The Circle Officer, Manpur, District - Gaya.
7. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj, Lakhanpur, Block - Manpur, District - Gaya.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr.Awnish Kumar, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr.Kinkar Kumar, SC-9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD)

Date : 21-04-2023

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. This writ petition has been filed as a Public Interest Litigation (P.I.L.) for issuance of directions to ensure that the Authorities construct Panchayat Sarkar Bhawan, Gram Panchayat Raj, Lakhanpur in Mauza- Lakhanpur, Thana No. 287, Khata No. 388 and Plot No. 814.

3. Whether the Panchayat Sarkar Bhawan is constructed at site A or B is an issue best left to the people's



representatives in the local self government institutions as well as the local authorities to decide based on various factors/parameters such as contained in the Departmental letter dated 26.11.2019 issued by the Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj

Department, to all District Magistrates. Considering the said departmental letter, this Court has earlier rejected another PIL seeking construction of Panchayat Sarkar Bhawan at a particular place, vide judgment dated 10.04.2023 passed in CWJC No. 3777 of 2023.

4. This Court is, therefore, not inclined to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction in respect of such matters of executive policy.

5. The writ petition is misconceived and is accordingly dismissed.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

shyambihari/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	25-04-2023
Transmission Date	

