

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5841 of 2019

=====

Arti Kumari @ Arti Devi, W/o Narendra Kumar @ Narendra Kumar Singh
Resident of Village- Shahpur, Ward No. 2, P.S. Nauhata, District- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme (ICDS), Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Rohtas, Sasaram.
5. The District Program Officer Rohtas, Sasaram.
6. The Child Development Project Officer(CDPO), Nauhata, Rohtas.
7. The Lady Supervisor, ICDS, Nauhata Block, Rohtas.
8. Nikki Kumari, Wife of Pintu Kumar Resident of Village- Shahpur, Ward No. 2, P.S. Nauhata, District- Rohtas.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Pandit, Advocate.
For the Respondents : Ms. Kumari Amrita (GP-3)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 12-04-2019

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the appointment of private respondent no. 8 on the post of Aanganwari Sewika, bypassing the rightful claim of the petitioner.

3. However, without entering into the merits of the contentions raised on behalf of the petitioner, this Court finds that the complaint which has been filed by the petitioner before the District Programme Officer, Rohtas



on 18.06.2018 has not yet been decided and no notice also has been issued to the stakeholders/parties.

4. This is not a healthy state of affairs and precisely for the non-functioning of these officers that there is a swamping of writ petitions in this Court. While sitting in the service roster, this Court has noticed that more than 30% of the cases relate to selection/engagement of Aanganwari Sewikas and Sahayikas and only because of the lackadaisical approach of the authorities, the aspirants/contenders have to approach this Court for a direction for disposal of their complaints/grievances/appeals.

5. Ms. Kumari Amrita, learned GP-3 has assured this Court that she will communicate this to the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department. In case such inaction continues, this Court would be constrained to direct for taking of disciplinary action against such erring employees.

6. However, for the present, this Court directs the petitioner to make a fresh representation before the District Programme Officer, Rohtas within a period of two weeks, detailing the grievances and the grounds on which it is being urged by the petitioner that the appointment of private respondent no. 8 on the post is not sustainable in the eyes of law and such representation shall be disposed



of by the concerned respondent within a further period of six weeks thereafter by a reasoned order, taking into account all facts.

7. Should the petitioner feel aggrieved by the order of the District Programme Officer, Rohtas, she would have the liberty to approach the District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram against the aforesaid order.

8. With the aforesaid direction/observation, the writ petition is disposed of.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

krishna/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	16.04.2019
Transmission Date	

