

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16457 of 2010

=====

Manorma Devi, wife of Sri Lakhandeo Ram, resident of Village- Keshradi, P.S.-
Daudnagar, District- Aurangabad.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Director Social Welfare Department, (I.C.D.S.),
Bihar, Patna.
2. District Magistrate, Aurangabad
3. Additional Collector cum Senior Officer incharge Public Grievance Cell,
Aurangabad.
4. District Programme Officer, Aurangabad
5. Child Development Project Officer, Daudnagar, Aurangabad.
6. Sub-Divisional Officer, Aurangabad.
7. Mukhiya, Anchcha Gram Panchayat, Daudnagar, Aurangabad.
8. Panchayat Sevak, Gram Panchayat, Anchcha, Daudnagar, Aurangabad.
9. Rambha Devi, w/o Sri Raj Kr. Ram, R/o Vill- Keshrari, P.S.- Daudnagar,
District- Aurangabad, at present working as Anganbari Sevika in Keshrari
Centre-2. Anchha Gram Panchayat, Daudnagar, District- Aurangabad.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Nawal Kishore Pd. Advocate.
For the Resp. No. 9 : Mr. Ram Sagar Singh, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 26-07-2017

The present writ petition has been filed for a direction
to the respondents for selection/appointment of the petitioner on the
post of Anganwari Sevika , Keshradi Centre-2 under Anchcha Gram
Panchayat, Daud Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
respondent no. 9 on the concerned post was illegally appointed as her



father-in-law was employed in Government service. It is further pointed out that the selection of the respondent no. 9 was cancelled by the order of the District Programme Officer, Aurangabad by memo no. 28 dated 25.10.2008 (Annexure-4). Moreover, by memo no. 761 dated 17.03.2010 (Annexure-7), the Child Development Project Officer had informed that the matter of selection would be considered after disposal of the writ petition filed by respondent no. 9 against cancellation of her selection.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent no. 9, on the other hand, invites attention to the letter no. 1206 dated 07.04.2010 from the Directorate, I.C.D.S., Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar to the Child Development Project Officer, Daud Nagar, Aurangabad informing that the allegation that the father-in-law of the respondent no. 9 was in Government service had been found to be false. It was stated that the name of the father-in-law of the respondent no. 9 was Sheo Dayal Ram and not Sheo Sharan Ram. Pursuant to the said letter, the respondent no. 9 was once again appointed as Anganwari Sevika in terms of letter no. 100 dated 20.04.2010 issued by the Child Development Project Officer, Daud Nagar, Aurangabad.

4. Having heard the parties and on consideration of the materials on record, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter. The stand of the respondent no. 9 that she was once again appointed as



Anganwari Sevika in terms of letter no. 100 dated 20.04.2010 by the Child Development Project Officer, Daud Nagar, Aurangabad after the allegation of her father-in-law being in Government service having been found to be false, has not been controverted by the petitioner.

5. In this view of the matter, the question of a direction for the petitioner’s selection/appointment as Anganwari Sevika does not arise. The writ petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/Chandran

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	28.07.2017
Transmission Date	N.A.

