

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17599 of 2019**

=====

Manju Kumari Wife of Ranjan Kumar Yadav Resident of Village-Baturi,  
Panchayat Meghaul, Block and P.S.-Pandaul, District-Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary Social Welfare Department,  
Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Secretary Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director Integrated Child Development Scheme, Directorate, Social  
Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. The District Magistrate Madhubani
5. The District Programme Officer Madhubani
6. The Senior-in-charge Officer Pandaul, District-Madhubani
7. The Child Development Programme Officer Pandaul, District-Madhubani
8. Pinky Kumari Wife of Rakesh Kumar R/o Village-Baturi, Panchayat-  
Meghal, Block and P.S. Pandaul, District-Madhubani

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Subhash Kumar Jha  
For the Respondent/s : Mr.S. K. Mandal ( SC-3 )

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN  
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

2      22-10-2019                      Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by selection of  
respondent No.8 as Anganbari Sevika of Anganbari Centre No.  
275, located under Panchayat Raj- Meghaul, in the District of  
Madhubani.

3. Under the guidelines issued governing selection  
and service conditions of Anganbari Sevika/Sahaiyaka under the  
Integrated Child Development Services, a forum has been



prescribed for the persons to raise their grievance. It does not appear from the records that the petitioner ever approached the competent authority raising any grievance against selection of respondent No.8 as Anganbari Sevika.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has drawn my attention to an application made by father-in-law of the petitioner to the District Programme Officer, Madhubani. The father-in-law of the petitioner was certainly not an applicant/aspirant for the post. He cannot be, therefore, said to be a person aggrieved, who could have approached the Child Development Project Officer, questioning selection of respondent No.8 as Anganbari Sevika.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this application is disposed of with a liberty to the petitioner to approach the competent authority by invoking provisions under the guidelines, raising her grievance against selection of respondent no.8 as Anganbari Sevika.

6. This application stands disposed of.

**(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)**

arun/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

