

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2577 of 2016

=====

Kabita Kumari @ Kavita Yadav Wife of Hira Lal Yadav, Resident of village- Chandrabana Panchayat Nahas Rupauli (South), P.O. and P.S.- Bisfi, District- Madhubani

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna. In-charge I.C.D.S. (Integrated Child Development Scheme), Bihar
4. The District Magistrate, Madhubani
5. The District Bal Vikash Pariyojana Padadhikari, Madhubani
6. The District Integrated Child Development Officer, District- Madhubani
7. The Block Child Development Officer, Bisfi, District- Madhubani
8. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Nahas Rupauli (South), P.O. and P.S.- Bisfi, District- Madhubani

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Purushottam Jha, Adv.

Mr. Vikash Kumar Jha, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Anisul Haque, AC to AAG-5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 03-01-2018

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner prays for a direction to the respondents to appoint her against the post of Anganbari Sevika for Ward No. 7/198, Nahas Rupauli (South) Gram Panchayat in the District of Madhubani having succeeded in the selection process of 2014.

Mr. Anisul Haque, learned AC to AAG-5, appears and files a counter affidavit. He submits in reference thereto that the process earlier initiated has been brought to close due to delay in completion and it would now be regulated by the request made by



the Child Development Project Officer as reflected from his letter dated 10.6.2017, whereby he has forwarded the list of vacancies on the post of Anganwari Sevika and Sahaika which needs to be filled up and which includes the centre for which the petitioner has filed the writ petition which appears at serial no.94 thereof. He thus submits that fresh selection process needs to be undertaken as per guidelines and if the petitioner fulfils the eligibility criteria, she can well apply for the same.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused the records, apart from the submissions made by the State in the counter affidavit on re-initiation of the process even the delayed action by the petitioner as well as her failure to approach the departmental authorities for raising grievance raised herein, within the stipulated period, does not persuade this Court to grant indulgence.

The writ petition is disposed of.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

Surendra/-

U			
---	--	--	--

