

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14053 of 2013

=====

1. Nilam Kumari Wife Of Santosh Kumar Resident Of Village - Mahna, P.O. Pursanda, P.S. Sikandara, District - Jamui

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Government Of Bihar, Patna
2. The Commissioner, Munger Division, Munger
3. The Director, ICDS, Bihar, Patna
4. The Collector, Jamui, District - Jamui
5. The District Program Officer, Jamui, District - Jamui
6. The Child Development Project Officer (CDPO) , Elam Nagar, Aliganj Block , District - Jamui
7. The Block Development Officer, Elam Nagar Aliganj, Block, District - Jamui
8. Smt. Ranju Devi Wife Of Late Subodh Singh Resident Of Village - Mahana, P.S. Sikandara, Elam Nagar, Aliganj, District - Jamui

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Shiv Kumar, AC to GA-3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 30-11-2016

No one appears on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the State is present.

In the present case, the petitioner is claiming appointment for the post of Aanganwari Sevika of Centre No. 150 in Ward No. 9 of village-Mahna under Gram Panchayat, Darkha, Elam Nagar, Aliganj Block in the District of Jamui.

An advertisement was published inviting applications for the post of Aanganwari Sevika and the petitioner also applied for

the said post. The claim of the petitioner has been rejected on various grounds including the husband of the petitioner, namely, Nilam Kumari, is a member of C.R.P.F., who is posted in Jammu & Kashmir and her father-in-law is a retired police personnel of Jharkhand State as well as one of her close relatives is also holding the post of Sevika. On that ground, the petitioner could not be selected.

It appears that the petitioner has not only approached this Court but she also approached the Collector in an appeal and the same has been rejected on 10.01.2014, but it has been brought on record by the State that there is suppression of facts made by the petitioner in the writ application which is very serious matter. If a person does not come with clean hands, cannot claim the equity.

In such view of the matter, this Court does not find any merit in the writ application which is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

ajaypd./-

U			
---	--	--	--