

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 10274 of 2014

=====

Renu Kumari wife of Bhushan Gupta resident of village + P.O. - Sahpur, P.S. - Sonbarsa Raj, District - Saharsa.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Department of Social Welfare (I.C.D.S.), Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Koshi Division, Saharsa.
5. The Regional/Divisional Programme Officer, Saharsa.
6. The District Magistrate, Saharsa.
7. The District Programme Officer, Saharsa.
8. The Child Development Project Officer, Block - Sonbarsa, District - Saharsa.
9. Anganwari Lady Supervisor, Child Development Project, Block - Sonbarsa, District - Saharsa, namely Nutan Kumari

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : M/s Pramod Mishra & Arun Kr, Advocates
For the Respondent/s : Mr Ashok Kumar Pathak, AC to GP XXI

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 28-11-2017

Heard counsel for the petitioner and counsel for the State.

2 The petitioner submits that because of certain allegations made by her husband against the Mukhiya, she has been victimized and being subjected to the proceedings leading to her termination. She draws the attention of the Court that one inspection conducted by the Lady Supervisor referred to in the order dated 28.02.2012 passed by the District Programme Officer, Saharsa. The



said report seems to have been communicated by letter No 384 dated 05.12.2011 issued by the office of the District Child Development Project Officer, Sonbarsa. He submits that the said report was never made available to the petitioner yet the same was made the basis of terminating the services of the petitioner. The non-availability of the report has been made Ground No 5 in the Angan Bari Appeal Case No 4 of 2012 filed before the Collector, Saharsa but the same has not been considered. This Court, therefore, considers it appropriate to remand this matter to the Appellate Authority for reconsideration of the grounds raised in the petitioner's Appeal Case No 4 of 2012 and decide the same in accordance with law expeditiously.

3 The writ petition is disposed of with the aforesaid direction.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

M.E.H./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	30.11.2017
Transmission Date	NA

