

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13637 of 2025

=====

Prem Kumar Son of Late Dharmraj Sharma, Resident of Village Pinjour P.S.
Parasvigaha, District Jehanabad (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Minor Water Resources Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Minor Water Resources Department, Patna.
3. The Additional Secretary Minor Water Resources Department, Patna.
4. The Engineer in Chief, Minor Water Resources Department, Patna.
5. The Chief Engineer, Minor Water Resources Department, Patna.
6. The District Magistrate, Jehanabad.
7. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Jehanabad.
8. The Executive Engineer M.I Department, Jehanabad.
9. The Junior Engineer M.I.Department, Jehanabad.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bhubneshwar Mahto, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Vikash Kumar, SC-11

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER
(Per: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)

2 31-10-2025 Following is the relief sought for in the present writ
application:-

“1. That this application is directed
for issuance of writ (P.I.L.) in the nature of
mandamus/ any other appropriate
writ/order/direction/commanding the
respondent to set up an independent inquiry
in case of Embezzlement of the public
money related with a project of renovation of
Kosdihara Bhariwa Ahar and Pyne irrigation
system Panchayat Amain and Pandui Block



Jehanabad District Jehanabad.

At the very outset the estimated cost of the project in question is Rs. 44243699.00 and its Unique code is BHR-JBD-163 for the year 2023-24 though the work under the aforesaid project was not completed and same remain incomplete about 50% of work but the payment of entire project has been done to the contractor without completing the entire work and as such the huge public money has been misappropriated.”

2. From the perusal of the record except for the averments made in the present writ application there is no supporting document or any other evidence to show that there has been embezzlement on the part of the Respondents.

3. Considering the same, we are of the view that there is no merit in the present writ application. The same is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Sudhir Singh, ACJ)

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Sachin/-

U			
---	--	--	--

