

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 12182 of 2014

=====

Shagufta Tamanna @ Tamanna Begum, Wife of Monazir, Resident of Village-
Bhatawar, P.S.- Rauta, Prakhand- Baisa, District- Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. District Magistrate, Purnea
3. Regional Development Officer, Purnea
4. District Programme Officer, Purnea
5. Child Development Project Officer, Baise, District Purnea
6. Shaheen Paraween, wife of Md Kausher Alam, Village - Bhatwar, P.O.-
Hafanian, P.S.- Rauta, District- Purnea

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bishwanath Prasad Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Gp32- Harish Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 25-03-2019

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

2 Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
because the petitioner's name was appearing in the voters' list as
Tamanna Begum, her claim for appointment as *Angan Bari Sevika*
for the Centre in question has been found to be untenable in law as
her application was made and considered for selection by the name
of *Shagufta Tamanna* instead of *Tamanna Begum*.



3 The issue has been enquired and the Regional Development Officer (for brevity, *RDO*), Purnea, after a thorough enquiry on all the issues, and examining the BPL Card issued in favour of the petitioner's father, the voters' list containing the name of the entire family of the petitioner and other significant and relevant documents, has concluded that there is nothing on record to support the petitioner's claim that the name *Tamanna Begum* and *Shagufta Tamanna* both, were names of the petitioner, and that one was her nick name.

4 The conclusion to this effect in favour of the petitioner by the District Programme Officer (for brevity, *DPO*) has been recorded merely on the basis of an affidavit sworn by the petitioner, that also, after her selection and in the proceedings before the DPO. Having noticed this fact, the RDO has rightly concluded that since claim of the petitioner is not based on any contemporaneous documents at the time of selection, such subsequent documents (affidavit) cannot be taken into consideration. The order of the RDO, Purnea dated 09.05.2014 is a detailed and considered order dealing with the claim of the petitioner. This Court does not find any infirmity in the conclusion as the same has been arrived after due process and due opportunity to the petitioner.



5 The writ petition is devoid of merit and the same is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

M.E.H./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	27.03.2019
Transmission Date	NA

