

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15410 of 2014

=====

Rekha Kumari W/o Bhuneshwar Sah Resident of Village Mohammadpur,
Patahi, Naya Tola, P.O. Patahi, P.S. Muzaffarpur Sadar, District Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Integrated Child Development Services, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur.
4. The District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur, District Muzaffarpur.
5. The District Programme Officer, Muzaffarpur, District Muzaffarpur.
6. The Child Development Project Officer, Mushahari, District Muzaffarpur.
7. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj, Patahi, Block Mushahari, District Muzaffarpur.
8. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj, Patahi, Block Mushahari, District Muzaffarpur.
9. Anita Kumari @ Anita Devi W/o Kamal Kishore Resident of Village Mohammadpur, Patahi, Naya Tola, P.O. Patahi, P.S. Muzaffarpur Sadar, District Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Arvind Kumar-2, S.C.17

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

2 22-11-2022 Petitioner has prayed for the following relief(s):

“(I) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of MANDAMUS, commanding and directing the Respondent Authorities to produce on record the selection letter of the Respondent no.9 issued under the signature of the Respondent no.6 whereby and where under the Respondent no.6 has been pleased to select the



Respondent no.9 as Aanganwari Sevika of Aanganwari Centre No.67 and on production the same may be quashed by issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of CERTIORARI.

(II) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of MANDAMUS, commanding and directing the Respondent Authorities to select the petitioner as Aanganwari Sevika of the Centre in question after canceling the selection of Respondent no.9 on the ground that the petitioner had better merit marks than the Respondent no.9 since the Respondent no.9 had merit marks 69 whereas the petitioner had merit marks 71.57 marks.

(III) For issuance of any other appropriate writ/writs, order /orders, direction/directions for which the writ petitioner would be found entitled under the facts and circumstances of the case.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection to the petition being heard by the Division Bench.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, under instructions, seeks permission to withdraw the petition, reserving liberty to take recourse to such other remedies as are otherwise available in accordance with law.

Petition is disposed of as withdrawn with the liberty aforesaid.

It is clarified that the period for which the petitioner has been pursuing remedies before this Court shall be excluded



for the purpose of computing the period of limitation.

Interlocutory Application(s), if any, shall also stand
disposed of.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Saurabh/K.C.Jha

U			
---	--	--	--

