

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 18300 of 2014**

=====

Laldaya Devi wife of Ramchandra Sada Resident of Harijan Tola, Village & Panchayat - Ghoanghepur, Police Station - Mahishi, Block - Mahishi, District - Saharsa

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Saharsa
3. The Regional Development Officer, Koshi Range, Saharsa
4. The District Program Officer, Saharsa
5. The District Welfare Officer, Saharsa
6. The Child Development Project Officer, Block - Mahishi, District - Saharsa

.... .... Respondent/s

=====

|                      |   |                                            |
|----------------------|---|--------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | M/s Satish Kr Singh & Dinesh Maharaj, Advs |
| For the State        | : | Mr Sanjay Kumar, AC to GA XIII             |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date: 10-07-2018**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondent-State.

2 It is submitted by the petitioner that the selection of the petitioner as Angan Bari Sevika for Centre No 136 at Harijan Tola, Ghoanghepur in the district of Saharsa has been cancelled at the instance of certain vested interests which were working against her. It is further submitted that at least one of the inspections, out of the three which have been conducted against the petitioner, was beyond the hours during which the Centre is not expected to be running.

3 This Court would find from the order passed by the District Programme Officer dated 15.09.2012 in Angan Bari Case No 10 of 2012-2013 as also the order dated 26.02.2014 passed by the Appellate Authority that is the Regional Development Officer,



Saharsa in Angan Bari Appeal Case No 34-42 of 2012 that the petitioner has been afforded opportunity by the authorities in respect of the first inspection dated 16.11.2011 in which four allegations were levelled against her. The response of the petitioner is just a bald denial. She has not met the charges by giving any plausible explanation or showing cause against the charges which were capable of being considered by the authorities. Her response is only that the charges are baseless and false.

4 Since no plausible explanation has been given which merits any consideration, no fault can be found in rejection of the same by relying upon the report of inspection which has been placed on record by way of counter affidavit. There is no rejoinder to the counter affidavit also.

5 In view of the aforesaid circumstances, this Court does not consider it appropriate to interfere with the detailed orders passed by the District Programme Officer and the Regional Development Officer, Koshi Division.

6 The writ petition is, therefore, devoid of any merit and is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

M.E.H./-

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR       |
| CAV DATE          | NA         |
| Uploading Date    | 14.07.2018 |
| Transmission Date | NA         |

