

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.22750 of 2019**

=====

Soni Kumari @ Shiyawanti Devi Wife of Shivnath Rajwar, Resident of Village- Tetariya, Ward No. 1 Under Gram Panchayat- Naur, Block- Nabinagar, District- Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social and Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Social and Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme, Indira Bhawan, West Boring Canal Road, Patna.
4. The Divisional Commissioner , Magadh Division, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate Cum Collector, Aurangabad.
6. The District Programme Officer Cum Integrated Child Development Officer, Aurangabad.
7. The Sub- Divisional Officer, Nabinagar, Aurangabad.
8. The Block Development Officer, Nabinagar, Aurangabad.
9. The Child Development Project Officer, Nabinagar, District- Aurangabad.
10. Punam Kumari, Wife of Rajeshwar Ram, Resident of Village- Tetaeya, Ward No. 2, Under Gram Panchayat- Naur Block- Nabinagar, District- Aurangabad.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Manoj Kumar Singh  
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Prashant Pratap (GP-2)

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2      10-01-2020                      The petitioner has put to challenge an order dated 26.09.2017 passed in Anganbari Sevika/Sahayika Selection Appeal No. 13 of 2016 by the District Programme Officer, Auragabad, whereby the petitioner's selection as Anganbari Sevika for Center No. 35 of ward No.1 of Tetariya Gran Panchayat in the District of Aurangabad has been held to be



invalid.

2. It is the petitioner's claim that the selection was made on the basis of the guidelines issued by the Welfare Department, Government of Bihar in 2011. From the impugned order it can be seen that the District Programme Officer reached a conclusion that the petitioner had submitted such certificates at the time of her selection in respect of her age, which were invalid. The petitioner had remedy of preferring appeal under the said 2011 guidelines before the Deputy Director, Welfare or an officer authorized by the Divisional Commissioner under Clause 10.7 of the said guidelines.

3. A counter affidavit has been filed which has been taken on record.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, has submitted that an appeal was preferred before the appellate authority in 2017 itself, which has so far not been decided. The case number of appeal has been stated to be 9 of 2017 pending before the Collector, Aurangabad.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this application is disposed of with a direction that let the petitioner's appeal being case No. 9 of 2017 be disposed of within three months from the date of receipt/production of a



copy of this order, if not already disposed of.

**(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)**

arun/-

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

