

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16484 of 2008

=====

Kumari Anuradha, wife of Tuntun Sharma, resident of village Pothma Purvi,
P.O. Bedhna, P.S. Barh, District Patna.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Human Resources Development, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Director, I.C.D.S. Directorate, Department of Social Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Patna.
6. The Child Development Project Officer, (CDPO), Barh Athamalgola, District Patna.
7. The Sub-divisional Officer, Barh, District Patna.
8. The Mukhiya, Purvi Bedhana Panchayat P.O. Bedhana, P.S. Barh, Pothama Par, District Patna.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Nageshwar Prasad Sinha, Advocate

For the Respondent s : None

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 18-08-2017

The present writ petition has been filed for a direction to the respondents to appoint the petitioner on the post of Angawari Sevika in the centre of Pothama Par Panchayat, Purvi Bedhana, Block Barh.

2. The short facts of the case according to the petitioner are that pursuant to an advertisement for appointment on the post of Anganwari Sevika for four Anganwari Centres, the petitioner made an application for Pothama Par Anganwari Centre and was the only



candidate for the post. It appears however, that while selection was made for three out of four advertised posts, as far as Pothama Par Centre was concerned, instead of the petitioner's selection being made as the only candidate, selection was erroneously made for 'Soyima' Centre. On a complaint being made by the petitioner, the District Magistrate, Patna by his order as contained in Annexure-5 of the writ petition, upon consideration of the report of the Sub-divisional Officer, cancelled the concerned selection and directed fresh selection process to be initiated.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite the aforesaid order of the District Magistrate having been passed as far back as in the year 2008 no step appears to have been taken for the fresh selection.

4. None appears on behalf of the respondents despite repeated calls.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and on a consideration of the materials on record, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter. The question of appointment of Anganwari Sevikas lies within the domain and discretion of the authorities. The District Magistrate, Patna has already passed orders for fresh selection process to be undertaken for appointment of Anganwari Sevikas.

6. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of granting liberty to the petitioner to pursue the matter before the concerned



authority in the light of the aforesaid order of the District Magistrate
(Annexure-5).

(Vikash Jain, J)

Chandran/BT

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	19.08.2017
Transmission Date	N.A.

