

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12718 of 2019

=====

Bibha Kumari W/o Amit Kumar R/o Village-Jaitipur, Ward No. 2, P.S. Naubatpur, District-Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director Integrated Child Development Scheme (I.C.D.S), Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate Patna
4. The District Programme Officer I.C.D.S, Patna
5. The Child Development Project Officer (CDPO) Naubatpur, Patna
6. Puja Kumari W/o Mantu Kumar R/o Village-Resident of Village-Jaitipur, P.S. Naubatpur, District-Patna

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sarvan Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Prashant Pratap (GP 2)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 27-06-2019

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner had earlier come before this Court vide C.W.J.C. No. 7286 of 2018 but the petitioner sought a permission from the Court to represent her case before the Child Development Project Officer (CDPO) Naubatpur, Patna for the needful. The aforesaid permission was granted to her by order dated 27.04.2018. Such representation before the CDPO, Naubatpur, Patna has not yielded any result in favour of the petitioner. Naturally so.



The CDPO, Naubatpur, Patna has no authority under the guidelines issued for appointment of Aanganwari Sevika.

3. According to the petitioner, name of the private respondent No. 6 was wrongly inserted in the merit list and that also on the basis of forged educational certificate furnished by her. A complaint was made by the petitioner before the District Programme Officer, Patna but no order was passed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has lost confidence on the manner of working of the District Programme Officer, I.C.D.S., Patna.

5. Such statements do not mean anything. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the appointment of Private Respondent No. 6 on the post of Aanganwari Sevika, the only authority where she could have first lodged the complaint is the District Programme Officer, I.C.D.S., Patna.

6. Without referring to what had happened earlier, this Court considers it appropriate now to direct the petitioner to make a complaint with respect to the



appointment of Private Respondent No. 6 as Aanganwari Seviak before the District Programme Officer, I.C.D.S., Patna within a period of four weeks from today. Should such a complaint be filed within the aforesaid period, the District Programme Officer, I.C.D.S., Patna shall enquire into the matter and after affording hearing to the parties, more particularly the petitioner, Private Respondent No. 6 and other stake holders, shall pass a reasoned order in accordance with law within a period of six weeks thereafter. If the petitioner is still aggrieved, she would have the option of preferring an appeal before the District Magistrate, Patna.

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

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

krishna/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	01.07.2019
Transmission Date	

