

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7042 of 2014

=====

Kiran Kumari, Wife of Surendra Choudhary, Resident of Village- Dayal Chak, P.O.- Paswan Tola, Police Station- Pandarak, District- Patna

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna
2. The Commissioner, Patna
3. The Director, I.C.D.S., Bihar, Patna
4. The Deputy Director, Welfare, Patna Division, Patna
5. The District Magistrate, Patna
6. The Child Development Project Officer, Pandarak, Patna
7. The District Programme officer, Patna
8. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj Dayalchak, District, Patna
9. The Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj Dayalchak, District- Patna

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vishwa Ranjan Choudhary
For the Respondent nos.1to7: Mr. Sunil Kumar, AC to SC-2

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-01-2015 The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 12.01.2013 (Annexure-4) passed by the respondent District Programme Officer, Patna, whereby the selection of the petitioner on the post of Anganwari Sahayika has been cancelled on the charges of certain irregularities committed by her. The petitioner is also aggrieved by the appellate order dated 31.07.2013 (Annexure-5) passed in Anganwari Appeal No.74 of 2013 by the respondent Deputy Director, Welfare, Patna Division, Patna, whereby the aforesaid appeal filed on behalf of the petitioner has been dismissed and the order passed by the respondent District Programme Officer, Patna has been affirmed.

While assailing the impugned orders (Annexures-4 and 5), learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has raised

the issues of facts, but he has not been able to show any violation of any statutory guidelines.

Apparently, the petitioner was working under a scheme on the post of Angwanwari Sahayika. She does not hold a civil post. She is alleged to have committed irregularities for running the Anganwari Centre in question. Before passing the impugned order, as contained in Annexure-4, an opportunity of hearing was given to the petitioner.

In view of the nature of allegation and the findings recorded by the two authorities, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the orders impugned.

Consequently, the writ petition has to fail and is, accordingly, dismissed, but without costs.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--