

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7060 of 2025

=====

Dhananjay Madhu Son of Bhagwan Singh, Resident of Village- Shekhpura,
P.O- Nandlalbad, P.S- Gaurichak, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayat Raj Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Patna.
3. The District Panchayat Raj Officer, Patna-cum-District Public Grievance Redressal Officer (First Appellate).
4. The Block Development Officer, Punpun, Patna.
5. The Block Panchayat Raj Officer, Punpun, District- Patna.
6. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj, Baranwa, Block- Punpun, District- Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sushant Pratap Singh, Adv
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Pankaj Kumar Singh, AC to GA (9)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 29-04-2025 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner
and learned AC to SC-9 appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking a direction upon the concerned respondent authorities to comply with the order-cum-guidelines issued by the Respondent No. 1 contained in Letter no. 2P/V2-59/2014/301/P.R. Patna dated 21.01.2015 by which the petitioner submits that the guidelines were issued that if and when the Mukhiya is absconding then under certain circumstance, the Deputy Mukhiya, in absence of the Mukhiya, has to be given the powers to discharge the duties



and responsibilities of Mukhiya. The petitioner further submits that in the present case, the Mukhiya-Mrs. Rakhi Devi has been absconding for sufficient length of time on account of her alleged involvement in some criminal matter for which two F.I.Rs have been registered against her bearing Gaurichak P.S. Case No. 776 of 2022 under Section 147/148/149/307/504/506/427 I.P.C. and Section 27 of Arms Act dated 22.11.2022 and another case bearing Gaurichak P.S. Case No. 777 of 2022 under Section 147/148/149/307/504/506/27 of Arms Act dated 22.11.2022. But despite the same, the Deputy Mukhiya has not been asked to discharge the duties and responsibilities of Mukhiya. The petitioner, therefore, has come to this Court seeking direction upon the respondent-authorities to implement the guidelines contained in letter dated 21.01.2015 by which the petitioner wants that the duties and responsibilities should be given to the Deputy Mukhiya in place of Mukhiya who has been absconding for substantial period of time.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the State submits that the petitioner is neither a member of the Ward nor the Deputy Mukhiya, who can be said to be aggrieved with the alleged inaction of the respondent-authorities and therefore, he does not have the locus to file the present writ application.



Therefore, the State opposes the maintainability of the present writ application.

4. On a careful perusal of Annexure-5 which is an order dated 20.01.2025 passed by the Second Appellate Authority, it is manifest that the petitioner had earlier approached the District Public Grievance Redressal Officer, who had dismissed his representation and thereafter, he had approached the First Appellate Authority where also order was passed against the petitioner and finally, the Second Appellate Authority, District Panchayati Raj Officer has also dismissed the second Appeal filed by the petitioner on the ground as stated in the said order.

5. It is strange that the first two orders passed by the District Public Grievance Redressal Officer and the First Appellate Authority have not even been brought on record by the petitioner and none of the three orders have been challenged in the present writ application. In such view of the matter, the present writ application is totally misconceived, devoid of merits and hence, the same is dismissed.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

kiran/-

U			
---	--	--	--

