

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12044 of 2015

=====

Pushpa Kumari w/o Jitendra Kumar Vill Pirho Ward No. 11, P.S. Karpi Dist Arwal.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1.The State of Bihar through its Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna.
- 2.The Deputy Director, Welfare Magadh Zone, Gaya.
- 3.The District Programme Officer, Arwal.
- 4.The Block Development Officer Cum Incharge, C.D.P.O., Arwal.
- 5.Geeta Devi, w/o Dharmendra Kumar, Vill Pidro, Ward No. 10, P.O. Rampur Chai, P.S. Karpi, District Arwal.
- 6.Geeta Devi, w/o Bakshi Rajbanshi, Vill Rajabigha, Rajwari Tola, P.O. Pandhara, P.S. Jhambor, District Aurangabad.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ram Suresh Rai, Adv & Mr. Binod Kumar Singh, Adv

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ram Balak Mahto, Adv

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MIHIR KUMAR JHA
ORAL JUDGMENT

2 10-08-2015 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Having regard to the nature of order passed by the two authorities upholding the appointment of respondent no. 6, Geeta Devi, on the post of Anganbadi Sevika, this Court will hardly find any reason to interfere with the same. Firstly the respondent no. 6, Geeta Devi belongs to the Scheduled Caste category and in the mapping done in the area for the post of Anganbadi Sevika, as per the maximum population of Scheduled Caste was

exclusively reserved for that category. The respondent-no. 6, Geeta Devi, belongs to that category and in fact was the sole appellant. This finding of fact cannot be disputed.

Mr. Ram Suresh Rai, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, however, has tried to highlight that there are two Geeta Devi and both are sisters and therefore one who has been appointed is a fake person.

The issue has been answered by the authorities in a correct manner, inasmuch as, such complicated question would not have been decided without adjudication made by the Civil Court. If the petitioner, was aggrieved as with regard to identification of Geeta Devi, she could have moved the Civil Court.

That being so, this writ application must fail and is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Mihir Kumar Jha, J)

Ranjan/-

U			
---	--	--	--