

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3287 of 2015

=====

Ranju Devi Wife of Sri Satyendra Kumar Resident of Village - Mansoorpur Dih,
P.S. - Khusrupur, District - Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Patna.
6. The Deputy Director, Welfare, Patna Division, Patna.
7. The District Programme Officer, Patna.
8. The Child Development Project Officer, Khusrupur, Patna.
9. Sheomuni Kumari, Sewika Centre-Mansurpur Dih, Code No. 64 Panchayat -
Haibatpur, Khusrupur, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anuj Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Sumant Kumar Singh, AC to GA 2
For the Respondent No. 9 : Mr. Mohan Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 09-07-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, respondent State and
the respondent No. 9.

2. The petitioner has sought setting aside the order dated
01.11.2014 passed by the Deputy Director Welfare, Patna Division,
Patna in Anganbari/Appeal Case No.593 of 2013 whereby the
respondent No. 9 has been reinstated as Anganbari Sevika at



Anganbari Centre Mansurpur Dih, Code No. 64 in the district of Patna.

3. The petitioner's counsel submits that on being found eligible, by order dated 14.06.2013 the petitioner was selected pursuant to a selection process. It is petitioner's submission that the petitioner could not have been removed and respondent No. 9 could not have been reinstated as Anganbari Sevika at the Centre No 64 without affording her an opportunity in the matter as she was selected pursuant to a selection process.

4. Counsel for the respondent State has filed his counter affidavit. It is his specific stand with reference to paragraph 2 of selection letter dated 14.06.2013 issued to the petitioner that it was specifically mentioned that engagement would abide by order passed by the Competent Court as regards reinstatement. The said assertion of the respondents has not been denied or controverted by filing any rejoinder.

5. Since the petitioner's selection was subject to the orders of the Competent Court and since subsequently the Competent Forum of the Deputy Director, Welfare, Patna has directed for reinstatement by order dated 01.11.2014 passed on the Anganbari/Appeal Case No. 593



of 2013, which was pending when petitioner was selected there is no occasion for this Court to interfere with the said order on prayer made by the petitioner.

6. The writ petition is devoid of any merits and the same is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

Prakash/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	

