

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3676 of 2021

Mayabati Kumari wife of Santosh Kumar resident of Village- Panaul, P.O.-
Chota Shekhpura, P.S.- Narhat, District- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, ICDS, Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Nawada.
5. The District Programme Officer, Welfare, Nawada.
6. The Child Development Project Officer, Narhat Block, Nawada.
7. The Bihar School Examination Board through its Secretary, Patna.
8. Laxmi Kumar daughter of Chodhi Prasad, wife of Sunil Chauhan, resident of Village- Panaul, P.O.- Chota Shekhpura, P.S.- Narhat, District- Nawada.
9. The Headmaster, Maya Pratap Kanya Uchch Vidyalaya, Chandi Nowa, Kashichak, District- Nawada.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shashi Shekhar Tiwary
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Lalit Kishore (Ag)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
ORAL JUDGMENT
Date : 08-02-2022

This matters heard via video conferencing due to
circumstances prevailing on account of COVID-19 Pandemic.

2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

3. In the instant petition, the petitioner has prayed for
the following reliefs:

- (i) That the appointment of
respondent no.8 Laxmi Kumari as
Aanganwari Savika at Aanganwari Center
no. 129 situated in Ward No. 7 in Village



Punaul under Narhat Block of Nawada district may be cancelled and the respondents may be directed to appoint the petitioner on the basis of her highest marks.

(ii) That the respondents may be directed to take immediate action on the representation filed by the petitioner and take immediate steps for removal of respondent no. 8 and appointment of the petitioner.

(iii) That the respondent BSEB may be directed to verify the marks sheet of respondent no.8 Laxmi Kumari as to whether she has got 282 or 323 marks and take suitable legal action.

(iv) That any other relief or reliefs may be allowed which may be just proper and equitable in the opinion of this Hon'ble Court.

3. During the pendency of the present petition, the petitioner has presented one I.A. No. 01 of 2022 in which he has pointed out memo no. 787 dated 23.8.2021 by which the respondent no.9 Laxmi Devi has been replaced by the petitioner, Mayabati Kumari. In the light of these facts and circumstances, the present petition do not survive for consideration. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that let there be a direction for the respondent for implementation in Memo No. 787 dated 23.8.2021(Annexure-1) to the I.A. No. 01 of 2022.



4. In the absence of representation or approaching the concerned respondent, the petitioner is not entitled to the aforesaid direction. Accordingly, the petition stands disposed of, reserving liberty to the petitioner to approach the concerned respondent by making a detailed representation within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of this order. On such representation, the competent authority is hereby directed to examine petitioner’s grievance and redress the same.

Ravi/-

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	20.02.2022
Transmission Date	NA

