

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1743 of 2020

=====

Shobha Kumari Wife of Satish Kumar, Resident of village- Parsauni Nath,
P.S.- Birimbazar, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare
Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate-cum- Collector, Muzaffarpur.
3. The Child Development Project Officer, Muzaffarpur.
4. The Additional Collector, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anuj Kumar, Advt.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Md. Raisul Haque (Sc10)
		Mr. Md. Obaidullah AC to SC-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

4 25-02-2020 Heard learned counsel for petitioner and learned
counsel for Respondent-State.

The petitioner's counsel submits that she apprehends
that her candidature for selection as *Anganwari Sevika* would be
rejected as she expects that certificate-cum-marks sheet in
support of her 10th pass qualification issued by the *Jharkhand*
State Open School would not be recognized for the selection
process.



The learned counsel for the State submits that from the pleading in the writ petition, it cannot be concluded that as to which selection process the petitioner has participated in for selection as *Anganwari Sevika*. Neither the details of advertisement nor the Center No. or Ward No. for which she has been applied has been mentioned. On such vague assertions, the petitioner has raised an apprehension that she would be excluded in the process of selection in view of the fact that she has been issued a certificate- cum-marks sheet by the *Jharkhand State Open School*, which she apprehends may not be considered as a recognized qualification. The apprehension is unfounded and not real and tangible. It is, on such inadequate pleadings, that the petitioner has sought a direction that the Certificate issued to her by such entity be directed to be considered as a valid, genuine and recognized qualification.

Objection is raised by the State counsel that on account of inadequate pleadings, the Court should not exercise jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in favour of the petitioner.

Submissions advanced by the State counsel merits consideration. No clear and tangible threat based on any details is made out from pleadings in the writ petition. The same are



inadequate for this Court to exercise jurisdiction under Article
226 of the Constitution of India.

The writ petition is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

shyambihari/-

U			
---	--	--	--

