

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9590 of 2024

=====

Manir Alam Son of Hanif Ansari, Resident of Village - Bhorha, Ward No.6,
P.S. Belsand, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Rural Development Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Rural Development Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner, Manrega, Rural Development Department, Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi.
5. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Sitamarhi.
6. The Programme Officer, Block-Belsand, District- Sitamarhi.
7. The Block Development Officer, Block-Belsand, District- Sitamarhi.
8. The Panchayat Rojgar Sevak, Gram Panchayat Rukanpur, Patahi, Block-Belsand, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Devendra Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.P.K. Shahi Advocate General

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 28-06-2024

The first question raised by the petitioner is as to whether the petitioner has got locus to agitate the issue herein by way of a Public Interest Litigation. From the averments, we are of the opinion that no such *locus standi* is conferred on the petitioner, especially since it is a private cause that is sought to be agitated. The petitioner's contention is that the petitioners and other co-villagers constructed cattle sheds as per the welfare



scheme implemented by the Rural Development Department. It is stated that they were asked to construct the cattle sheds using own money and further to submit the vouchers for reimbursement of the amounts expended. It is contented that then no reimbursement was ordered, the Lokpal (Manrega), District, Sitamarhi was approached and it had passed an order dated 19.06.2023. There is nothing stated as to the constitution of the Lokpal or the efficacy of the recommendations made by it. The allegation is also that the Lokpal has found the 6th respondent to be responsible for the misuse of the amounts due, who also has not been impleaded in the personal capacity.

2. In the totality of the circumstances as noticed above, we find absolutely no reason to entertain the writ petition and we dismiss the same.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Harish Kumar, J)

Anushka/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	01.07.2024
Transmission Date	

