

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 3902 of 2015**

=====

Nutan Kumari wife of Mukesh Yadav @ Mukesh Kumar Yadav resident of village  
- Janardan di, P.S- Haveli Kharagpur District-Munger.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Director (ICDS) Social Welfare Department, Govt of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Director (ICDS) Social Welfare Department, Govt of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Munger.
5. The District Programme Officer, Munger.
6. The Child Development Project Officer, Haveli Kharagpur, Munger
7. Sindhu Kumari wife of Pankaj Kumar resident of village - Janardan di, P.S-  
Haveli Kharagpur, District-Munger.

.... .... Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                                     |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr Hitesh Suman,<br>Ms Usha Kumari Singh, Advocates |
| For the S t a t e    | : | Mr Mukesh Prasad, AC to GP XVIII                    |
| For Respondent No 7  | : | Mr Dharendra Nath Jha, Advocate                     |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date: 13-08-2018**

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

2 The petitioner has challenged the order passed by the  
Deputy Director (Welfare), Munger Division, Munger in Appeal No  
60 of 2014.

3 It is submitted that the petitioner has been held  
disqualified even though, as per plain reading of the Guidelines of  
2011, it would be apparent that only the daughter-in-law of the village  
concerned is competent to seek appointment. Making such



submission, it is contended that the disqualification specified in Clause 4.9 of the Guidelines of 2011 should be read only as disqualification for the daughter-in-law on account of her father-in-law being in Government employment. Such submission could have been entertained if the Guideline prescribed otherwise. Guideline clearly specified that daughter of a Government employee is disqualified. Admittedly, the father of the petitioner is a Government employee. In view of such position, the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner does not appear to be tenable since the petitioner does not come under the Guideline for consideration of appointment. There is no reason to interfere with the order dated 20.12.2014 passed by the Deputy Director (Welfare), Munger Division, Munger in Appeal No 60 of 2014.

4 The writ petition is devoid of merit and is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

M.E.H./-

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR       |
| CAV DATE          | NA         |
| Uploading Date    | 14.08.2018 |
| Transmission Date | NA         |

