

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10750 of 2008

=====

Renu Devi, wife of Bimlanand Jha, resident of village- Porla, P.S. – Azam Nagar, District – Katihar.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Department of Welfare, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Katihar.
3. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Katihar
4. The District Welfare Officer, Katihar.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Barsoi, District – Katihar
6. The Block Development Officer, Azamnagar, District – Katihar.
7. The Child Development Project Officer, Azamnagar, District – Katihar.
8. The Chairman cum – Mukhiya, Jalki Gram Panchayat, P.S. – Azam Nagar, District – Katihar.
9. Ananda Das, wife of Jyotindra Nath Das, resident of village- Porla, P.S. – Azam Nagar, District – Katihar.

.... Respondents

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 27-04-2015

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner
and learned counsel for the State.

2. There is a counter affidavit on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that she had filed petition as to her non-selection as an Anganbari Sevika before the Collector who referred the matter to the Sub-Divisional Officer and the same was rejected vide Annexure – 9.

3. The petitioner has challenged the

selection of respondent no. 9 on various grounds. In the counter affidavit, it is stated that as per the directions issued by Integrated Child Development Scheme (hereinafter referred to as “ICDS”), a person had to be selected as Anganbari Sevika from amongst the wife of persons of the locality who were the dominating group in that locality. It is pointed out that in the locality, in which the petitioner was living and had filed application, was dominated by backward persons and, as such, the Anganbari Sevika had to belong to backward class. The writ petitioner being a general category was, thus, not to be considered.

4. In view of the above, I am not inclined to interfere in the matter. This writ petition merits no consideration. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J.)

Rajeev/-

U			
---	--	--	--