

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8593 of 2020

Nibha Kumari, wife of Sukh Nandan Kumar, Daughter of Surendra Prasad Gupta, Resident of Village- Siswa Mangal, Under Gram Panchayat- Dalpat Vishnpur, Police Station- Dakha, Under Block- Dakha, District- East Champaran, Motihari 845427.

... .. 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, Tirhut Division, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate cum Collector, Motihari, East Champaran.
6. The District Programme Officer, Integrated Child Development Scheme, Motihari, East Champaran.
7. The Sub- Divisional Officer, Dakha, East Champaran.
8. The Block Development Officer, Dakha, East Champaran.
9. The Child Development Project Officer Dakha, District- Motihari, East Champaran.
10. Rasmita Priya, wife of Pintu Prasad, Resident of Village- Siswa Mangal, Under Gram Panchayat- Dalpat Vishanpur, Ward No. 9, Police Station- Dakha, Under Block- Dakha, District- Motihari, East Champaran, 845427.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha, GA-7

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 03-03-2021 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has put to challenged an order dated 02.07.2020 as contained in Memo No. 1710, whereby her selection against the post of *Anganwari Sevika* has been set aside by the District Programme Officer, Integrated Child



Development Scheme(I.C.D.S.), East Champaran, Motihari. The petitioner has admittedly a remedy before the functionaries under the Scheme, which the petitioner could have availed questioning the impugned order.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that because of prevailing Covid-19 pandemic the petitioner could not approach the competent authority assailing the impugned order.

4. Considering the facts and circumstances, this application is disposed of with an observation that the petitioner shall be at liberty to approach the competent authorities within one month from today assailing the impugned order. If she does so, her application should be decided on merit without raising any question of limitation. This observation has been made in the light of the fact that the petitioner might not have been able to approach the competent authority by making appropriate application because of the prevailing pandemic situation.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

Rajesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

