

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15437 of 2024**

=====

Anil Kumar Singh S/o Chakradhari Singh Resident of village- Kuari  
Khurd, Post Office Balwa Kuari, Block- Hajipur, P.S.- Hajipur Sadar District-  
Vaishali, Mobile no.- 9006662222

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Bihar, Patna
2. The State of Bihar, Principal Secretary, Panchyati Raj, Bihar, Patna
3. Principal Secretary, Rural Development, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. Commissioner, MGNREGA-cum-CEO, Bihar Rural Development Society,  
Patna.
5. Additional Director General of Police, Economic offences Unit, Bihar,  
Patna.
6. District Magistrate, Vaishali at Hajipur District- Vaishali
7. Sub-divisional Programme Officer, MENREGA Hajipur Vaishali
8. Block Development Officer, Hajipur, District- Vaishali
9. District Panchayat Raj Officer, District- Vaishali
10. Block Panchayat Raj Officer, Hajipur, District- Vaishali
11. Sri Rakesh Kumar, Juniour Engineer, Panchayati Raj, Block- Hajipur,  
Vaishali
12. Sri Pankaj Kumar Singh, Panchayat Rojgar Sevak, Block-Hajipur, Vaishali.
13. Sri Raj Narayan Singh, Panchayat Sachiv, Bishunpur Baladhari Panchayat,  
Vashali.
14. Srimati Sabita Devi W/o Nand Kishore Gupta, Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat  
Raj, Bishunpur Baladhari, Hajipur at Vaishali.
15. Srimati Punam Devi, W/O Nand Kishor Shah, Former Mukhiya (Period  
1916-21) Gram Panchayat Raj, Bishunpur Baladhari, Hajipur at Vaishal

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

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

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**  
**and**  
**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY**  
**ORAL JUDGMENT**  
**(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)**

Date : 25-10-2024



The above Public Interest Litigation is filed seeking for an enquiry by a proper agency to examine the quality of various works carried out in the Gram Panchayat Raj, Bishunpur Baladhari, Hajipur at Vaishali. The petitioner in the writ petition has listed out a number of projects and alleged that the raw materials lacked quality and there are many irregularities committed in disbursing the labour charges. The petitioner also speaks of various representations filed.

2. A reading of the writ petition would indicate that bland allegations are made by the petitioner. There is nothing stated as to how, the petitioner came to know that the raw materials used lacked in quality or that irregularities were committed in the disbursement of labour charges. The petitioner seeks a roving inquiry based on bland allegations without substantiation.

3. A Public Interest Litigation is not a fishing expedition and on mere allegations raised, without any substantiation there cannot be any investigation directed.

4. We expressed our minds in no uncertain terms and the learned Advocate then sought for withdrawal of the



writ petition.

5. Writ petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.

**(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)**

**( Partha Sarthy, J)**

aditya/-

|                   |             |
|-------------------|-------------|
| AFR/NAFR          |             |
| CAV DATE          |             |
| Uploading Date    | 28.10.2024. |
| Transmission Date |             |

