

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1286 of 2026

=====

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, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Second Appellant Authority-cum-Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The First Appellant Authority -cum- the Divisional Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna.
4. The Second Appellant Authority -cum- District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The First Appellant Authority -cum- Additional Collector, Patna.
6. The District Public Grievances Redressal Officer, Patna.
7. The Sub Divisional Public Grievance Redressal Officer, Masaurdhi, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sushant Pratap Singh
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Vivek Prasad, GP 7
		Ms. Manisha Singh, AC to GP 7

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- | | | |
|---|------------|---|
| 2 | 02-02-2026 | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The present writ application has been filed for a direction upon the respondent authorities to review the orders passed by the Public Grievance Redressal Officer, the First Appellate Authority and the Second Appellate Authority in Complaint Nos. 428110110052307600 and 428110108012407946, which were filed under the provisions of the Bihar Public Grievance Redressal Act, 2015.2. The facts giving rise to the present writ application is that |
|---|------------|---|



the petitioner had filed complaints under the Bihar Public Grievance Redressal Act, 2015 (in short, 'the 2015 Act'), alleging irregularities in the execution of development works in Gram Panchayat Baranwa, Block – Punpun. The Panchayat authorities, including the Mukhiya, Technical Assistant and Panchayat Secretary, had committed irregularities while executing the works funded under the Fifth and Sixth Finance Commission guidelines. The petitioner has specifically alleged overlapping execution of PCC work over previously completed work and wrongful expenditure of public money. Based on such allegations, the petitioner sought investigation by lodging the First Information Report as well as initiation of departmental proceedings against the erring officials.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to the complaints filed by the petitioner, certain inquiries were conducted on the directions of the appellate authorities. The inquiry reports disclosed serious financial irregularities and embezzlement of public funds. Despite such findings, the respondent authorities have not taken any action against the erring officials.
4. Learned Counsel further submits that instead of taking



action against erring officials, the authorities have passed an order directing registration of First Information Report against the petitioner, his wife and others, which is arbitrary and mala fide. The petitioner has submitted a representation before the Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department on 18.09.2025 for reviewing the order passed by the authority, but the same has not been considered by the authorities.

5. On the other hand learned Counsel for the state submits that that the present writ application has been filed due to political reason inasmuch as the writ application involves disputed questions of fact, particularly with regard to the actual execution of development works, alleged overlapping of PCC roads, quantum of financial expenditure etc.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material available on records.
7. It is well settled principle that the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution being special and extraordinary, it should not be exercised casually or lightly on mere asking by the litigant. The remedy under Article 226 of the Constitution shall not be available



except where violation of some statutory duty on the part of statutory authority is alleged.

8. In the present case, this Court finds that in the enquiry conducted by the authorities, the involvement of ex-Mukhiya, i.e. wife of the petitioner, was detected in defalcation of public fund, for which a direction has been issued for lodging First Information Report against the petitioner, his wife and five others. The present writ application is not banafide and has been filed for obstructing proper investigation by the police.
9. Further, the petitioner has not been able to demonstrate any jurisdictional error, perversity, illegality or violation of statutory provisions in the orders passed by the authorities warranting interference by this Court.
10. Accordingly, this writ application is dismissed, being devoid of any merit.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	√		
---	---	--	--

