

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16613 of 2019

=====

Pramila Kumari W/o Amresh Kumar Resident of Village Ward No.05,
Tulapatti, P.S. Pipra, Dist.Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director (ICDS), Social Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate, Supaul
4. The District Program Officer, Supaul
5. The District Project Officer (ICDS), Supaul
6. The Child Development Project Officer, Block-Pipra, Dist.Supaul.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amar Nath Yadav
For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Kumari Amrita (Gp3)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 27-08-2019 The petitioner had applied for being considered for her engagement as *Anganbari Sahaika* at the concerned centre in the year 2015.

It is the case of the petitioner that an *Aam Sabha* was convened and the name of the petitioner found place in the merit list at the top. No appointment letter was however issued to the petitioner.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the centre is not being run and up till



now, no appointment has been made.

Ms. Amrita, learned G.P.-3 has informed this Court that if at all any panel would have been prepared, the life of such panel would only be for one year. The petitioner, it is her assertion, has approached this Court after an unusual delay of four years and in such circumstances, no order can be passed. Even if the C.D.P.O of the concerned block is given a direction, no useful purpose would be served as it appears that the appointment process has been completely abandoned.

This Court has some difficulty in accepting the aforesaid submission of the learned counsel for the State. The aspirants who had applied against the advertisement for appointment for the post are required to be informed about such appointment process. It cannot be left midway. Another aspect of the matter which requires an immediate attention of the authorities is that the centre has not been running for all these years.



In any view of the matter, the petitioner ought to be informed about the final outcome of the recruitment process which according to him began in the year 2015.

In case the petitioner makes a suitable representation before the concerned C.D.P.O within a period of two weeks from today, the concerned C.D.P.O shall inform the petitioner about the stage of such recruitment process. If at all the recruitment process has been abandoned, it is high time that the authorities responsible for running the ICDS initiate the process for appointment. In that event, the petitioner, if she so desired, may apply.

With the aforesaid observation/direction, the writ petition stands disposed off.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

Shageer/-

U			
---	--	--	--

