

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6313 of 2016

=====

Renu Devi Wife of Jai Prakash Thakur resident of village and P.O. -
Saraigarh, P.S. - Kishanpur, Block - Saraigarh Bhaptiyahi, District - Supaul.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Old Secretariat, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Social Welfare Department (I.C.D.S.) Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Commissioner, Koshi Division, Saharsa.
5. The District Magistrate, Supaul.
6. The District Programme Officer (I.C.D.S.), Supaul.
7. The Sub Divisional Officer, Supaul.
8. The Block Development Officer, Saraigarh Bhaptiyahi, District - Supaul.
9. The Child Development Project Officer, Saraiyagarh, Bhaptiyahi, District - Supaul.
10. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Saraigarh, P.S. - Kishanpur, District - Supaul.
11. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Saraigarh, P.S. - Kishanpur, District - Supaul.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

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

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Mrigendra Kumar, AC to GA-4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 03-05-2018 Heard Mr. Amarnath Jha, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Mrigendra Kumar, learned AC to GA-4, for the

State.

The grievance of the petitioner is that a selection process
for appointment of Anganwari Sahaika , Centre No. 97, Saraigarh
Gram Panchayat, Block Saraigarh Bhaptiyahi, in the District of
Supaul has not been taken to its logical conclusion.

According to the petitioner, the petitioner applied for
such post on 20.9.2014, an Aam Sabha was held on 18.8.2015 but



it was resolved to keep the exercise in abeyance, subject to the directions obtained from the Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme.

A counter affidavit is filed and the position is not disputed, rather at paragraph-17 it is stated that the District Magistrate, Supaul vide his letter dated 22.6.2016 has directed for completion of the process as per 2016 guidelines. Mr. Mrigendra Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the State, very fairly admits that the counter affidavit is silent as to the follow up steps taken.

Mr. Amarnath Jha, learned counsel for the petitioner, informs that the matter is in limbo as neither initiated process has been completed or any fresh process has been started.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering that the District Magistrate, Supaul having appreciated the predicament has sought guidelines from the Director, ICDS which is not forthcoming, I deem it proper to direct the District Magistrate, Supaul to take the selection process to its conclusion in accordance with law within a period of three months of the receipt/ production of a copy of this order.

With the aforementioned direction, the writ petition is disposed of.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

Surendra/-

U			
---	--	--	--

