

3IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1364 of 2026

=====

Anil Kumar S/o Late Karamchand Patel, R/o-Maheshpur, PO Salehpur, PS Falka, District-Katihar, State-Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Election Commission of India Through the Chief Election Commissioner, Nirvachan Sadan, Ashoka Road, New Delhi-110001.
2. The Chief Electoral Officer, Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna-800015, Bihar.
3. The State of Bihar Through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna-800015.
4. The Finance Department, Government of Bihar, Through the Principal Secretary, Finance Department, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna-800015.
5. The Department implementing the scheme Mukhyamantri Mahila Rojgar Yojna, Through its Principal Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna-800015.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Abhigyan Kumar, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. P. K. Shahi, AG
		Mr. Vikas Kumar, AC to AG
For the ECI	:	Mr. Siddhartha Prasad, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)
Date : 20-02-2026

The writ petition has been filed by Anil Kumar with the following prayer(s):

“1(i) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction calling for the complete records relating to the conception, approval, budgetary allocation, advertisements, beneficiary selection criteria and date-wise Direct Benefit Transfer (DBT) details of the scheme titled "Mukhyamantri Mahila Rojgar Yojna", particularly during the subsistence of the Model Code of Conduct.



(ii) Direct the Respondent-State of Bihar to file a detailed affidavit disclosing;

a. total amount disbursed under the scheme,

b. number of beneficiaries,

c. date-wise instalments released,

d. authority permitting continuation of DBT during election period, and

e. correspondence exchanged with the Election Commission of India.

(iii) Constitute an Independent High-Level Inquiry Committee, preferably headed by a retired Judge of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India or this Hon'ble Court, assisted by financial, administrative and election-law experts, to inquire into:

a. the legality,

b. intent,

c. timing, and

d. electoral impact of implementation of the said scheme during the election period.

(iv) Direct that the aforesaid inquiry shall be conducted under the supervision and monitoring of this Hon'ble Court, with liberty to the Committee to summon records, call officials, examine witnesses, and submit periodical status reports before this Hon'ble Court.

(v) Direct the Inquiry Committee to specifically examine:

(a) whether continuation of the scheme violated the Model Code of Conduct,

(b) whether the scheme amounted to inducement or bribery of voters;

(c) whether public funds were misused for electoral advantage;

(d) whether there was selective or discriminatory non-enforcement of election norms by the Election Commission of India.



(vi) Upon completion of the inquiry, direct initiation of appropriate civil, criminal and departmental proceedings against responsible officials and authorities, if any illegality, misconduct or abuse of power is found.

(vii) Issue a writ of mandamus directing the Election Commission of India to frame and strictly enforce uniform, binding and transparent guidelines governing Direct Benefit Transfer and welfare scheme disbursement during election periods, applicable uniformly across all States and Union Territories.”

2. The main allegation seems to be that while the Model Code of Conduct during Bihar Legislative Assembly Election, 2025 was in force, at that point of time, some money was transferred in the accounts of the beneficiaries under *Mukhyamantri Mahila Rojgar Yojna*, which according to the petitioner should not have been done.

3. On the other hand, learned Advocate General, submits that the *Mukhyamantri Mahila Rojgar Yojna* was launched in September, 2025 itself aims to promote women's empowerment through self employment and livelihood opportunities by providing financial assistance to one woman from each family in the State. The assistance was for utilization of the same in area of choice of beneficiaries, including agriculture, animal husbandry, handicrafts tailoring, weaving



and other small scale enterprises. Moreover, if the petitioner had any grievance, he should approach the concerned authority or the forum.

4. Considering the submissions; so far the prayer of the petitioner seeking information regarding the total amount disbursed under this scheme, number of beneficiaries, date-wise instalments released etc., it is open to the petitioner to approach the appropriate authority under the Right to Information Act to get such information. So far as violation of Model Code of Conduct is concerned, there is nothing in the petition that the petitioner has approached the Election Commission of India. There is no specific instances have been given that while the Model Code of Conduct was in force, there has been violation and the money has been disbursed to the beneficiaries under the *Mukhyamantri Mahila Rojgar Yojna*. Therefore, in absence of specific averments taken in the writ petition, we do not feel it proper to entertain this Public Interest Litigation.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(Sangam Kumar Sahoo, CJ)

(Harish Kumar, J)

Anjani/-	
AFR/NAFR	N/A
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	23.02.2026
Transmission Date	N/A

