

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9608 of 2021

=====

Sunaina Kumari @ Sunaina Devi Wife of Sri Sujeet Kumar @ Sujeet Yadav
resident of village- Mamurabad, ward no. 05, P.O.- Mirchaiganj, P.S.-
Noorsarai, District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, patna
2. The Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme (ICDS), Bihar, 2nd Floor, Indira Bhawan, R.C. Singh Path, P.O. and P.S.- Punaichak, District- patna
3. The District Magistrate cum Collector, Nalanda
4. The District Programme Officer (ICDS) Nalanda
5. The C.D.P.O. Noorsarai, P.O. and P.S.- Noorsarai, District- Nalanda
6. Smt. Bina Kumari Lady Supervisor, C.D.P.O. Office, Noorsarai, P.O. and P.S.- Noorsarai, District- Nalanda

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shyama Kant Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha, GA 3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 08-03-2022

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. In the instant petition, petitioner has prayed for the following relief/reliefs:

“That the present writ petition is for issuance of an appropriate writ/writs in nature of mandamus commanding and directing the respondent to issue formal letter of engagement in her favour as Aanganbadi Sevika under ward no. 05 in Gram Panchayat Raj Mamurabad in district of Nalanda in response to the memo no. 394 dated 03.03.2021 passed and issue under the authority of District Programme



Officer (ICDS), Nalanda taking into consideration her status and merit position prepared maintained for the said appointment from which the candidature of Rinku Kumari was nullified/cancelled in view of the forged certificate utilized for the purposes of appointment/engagement and for other necessary relief/reliefs to the basis of the facts and circumstances of the case enumerated and discussed hereinafter.”

3. The petitioner has not assailed the order of appointment issued to the 6th respondent – *Smt. Bina Kumari*. That apart petitioner has statutory remedy of appeal before the Appellate Authority against non selection of petitioner and appointment of the 6th respondent. The same has not been exhausted.

4. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed as premature, reserving liberty to prefer an appeal before the Appellate Authority in accordance with law.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

GAURAV S./-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	10.03.2022
Transmission Date	

