

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18828 of 2013

=====

Anita Devi, Wife of Ram Babu Ram, resident of Village - Hasanpur, P.O. & P.S. -
Nayagaon, District - Saran (Chapra)

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare
Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme (I.C.D.S.) Social Welfare
Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Assistant Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme, (I.C.D.S.)
Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Chapra
5. The District Magistrate, Chapra
6. The District Programme Officer, Saran (Chapra)
7. The Child Development Project Officer, Sonapur
8. The Gram Panchayat, Gopalpur, Block - Sonapur, District - Saran
9. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat, Gopalpur, Block - Sonapur, Saran
10. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Gopalpur, Block - Sonapur,
Saran

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Verma, Advocate.

For the Respondents : Mr. Mahendra Prasad Verma, AC to SC-20

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 17-07-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the respondents.

2. The present petition has been filed for quashing the order issued under the signature of the District Programme Officer, Saran as contained under memo no. 468 dated 17.04.2012 whereby and whereunder the petitioner's service as Anganwari Sahayika of Anganwari Centre, Centre Code No. 34 Sonapur Priyojna has been terminated.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner makes a short submission to the effect that a composite order was passed by the District Programme Officer, Saran at Chapra (Annexure-2) against the



petitioner as well as Anganwari Sevika, Seema Kumari. The said Seema Kumari preferred C.W.J.C. No. 17431 of 2012 which was allowed by this Court in its order dated 21.06.2013 as the impugned order had been passed without serving a copy of the enquiry report. The petitioner herein has stated in paragraph 6 of the writ petition that no show cause was communicated to her, and as such the case of the petitioner stands on similar footing to that of Seema Kumari.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents appears and has been heard. It is clearly stated that point wise show cause notice to the petitioner was issued but the petitioner did not file any reply thereto.

5. Having regard to the aforesaid, this Court does not find merit in the writ petition. Specifically being asked, learned counsel for the petitioner was unable to point out from his writ petition that a copy of the inquiry report was not served upon the petitioner.

6. In view of the issue of service of show cause being in dispute, the petitioner has been unable to show that her case stands on similar footing to that of Anganwari Sevika Seema Kumari and as such similar benefit as in the order of this Court passed in C.W.J.C. No. 17431 of 2012 cannot be extended to her.

7. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/BT

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	24.07.2017
Transmission Date	N.A.

