

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

**Letters Patent Appeal No.943 of 2014
IN
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 22400 of 2012**

=====

Chhaya Rani Singh W/o Jagdish Kumar Singh @ Ramanand Singh Resident of
Village Puwal, P.O. Dhachna, Police Station Barsoi, District Katihar.

.... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary, Department of Welfare, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director Social Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Collector, Katihar.
4. The District Programme Officer, Katihar.
5. The Block Development Officer, Block Barsoi, District Katihar.
6. The Child Development Programme Officer, Barsoi, District Katihar.
7. The Mukhiya cum Chairman, Gram Sabha Gram Panchayat Belwadangi Block,
Barsoi, District Katihar.
8. The Rangila Singh W/o Hem Narayan Singh Resident of Jagatpur, Police
Station Barsoi, District Katihar.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Md. Rahmatullah, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sumant Kumar Singh, Ac to GA-2

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 23-03-2017

Seeking exception to an order dated 18.4.2014 passed
by the learned Writ Court in C.W.J.C. No.22400 of 2012 in the
matter of terminating the appointment of the petitioner as an
Anganwari Sevika, this appeal has been filed under Clause-10 of the
Letters Patent.

A perusal of the order of the learned Writ Court goes
to show that after going through the original records, learned Writ



Court has recorded a finding to say that the petitioner’s appointment initially based on residence is doubtful.

It is also seen that the writ Court after taking into consideration various aspects of the matter, including the termination order of 2006, the order passed by the Director, I.C.D.S. on 6.9.2012 after remand by this Court in C.W.J.C. No.10473 of 2007 has refused to interfere with the matter as the question of residence of the appellant was found to be doubtful

Keeping in view the reasons that weighed with the learned Writ Court for refusing to grant the claim of the petitioner, we see no error in the same warranting re-consideration.

The application is dismissed.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Sudhir Singh, J)

K.C.jha/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	29.03.2017
Transmission Date	N/A

