

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.122 of 2015**

=====

Parwati Kumari @ Parwati Devi wife of Shankar Mandal, resident of  
village- Ekdahra-Gahumani, P.S.- Singheshwar, District- Madhepura

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director, I.C.D.S., Department of Social Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Koshi Division, Saharsa
4. The District Magistrate, Madhepura
5. The District Programme Officer, I.C.D.S., Madhepura
6. The Block Development Officer, Singheshwar, District- Madhepura
7. The Child Development Project Officer (C.D.P.O.), Singheshwar, District- Madhepura
8. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj- Ekdahra Gahumani, Block- Singheshwar, District- Madhepura
9. Sanjani Devi, wife of Manoj Mandal, resident of village- Maliya, P.S. + District- Madhepura

.... .... Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kumar Mukul  
For the Respondent/s : AC to SC – 10

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      18-01-2017                      Heard Sri Vijay Kumar Mukul, learned counsel for the  
petitioner and learned AC to SC No. 10.

The petitioner invoking writ jurisdiction of this court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has made a prayer for directing the respondents to hold fresh Aam Sabha by removing private respondent from the post of Anganwari Sevika in Ward No. 10 of Gram Panchayat Raj - Ekdahara Gehumani, Block –Singheshwar, district -Madhepura. It was submitted by



learned counsel for the petitioner that after noticing the fact that the respondent no. 9 who was the daughter of the same locality was selected as Anganwari Sevika, which was contrary to the Scheme, the petitioner immediately filed objection before the Public Grievance Cell , Collectorate, Madhepura, however she is not having copy of the said objection. He submits that the grievance of the petitioner has not been redressed till date. However, after some argument, he makes a prayer for disposal of the present case so that petitioner may approach the authority concerned with specific grievance. The prayer allowed. The writ petition stands disposed of.

It goes without saying that if within a period of six weeks from today the petitioner approaches the authority concerned with specific pleading , the same may be examined and the authority concerned may pass appropriate order in accordance with law without any delay.

**(Rakesh Kumar, J)**

Praful/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

