

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2564 of 2020

=====

Sindhu Kumari Wife of Chiranjeevi Kumar Sinha, Resident of Village and
P.O. - Dhurgaon, P.S.- Ekangarsarai, District- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner Patna, Division, Patna.
4. The Director, I.C.D.S., Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Nalanda at Bihar Sharif.
6. The District Programme Officer, Nalanda at Bihar Sharif.
7. The Child Development Project Officer, Ekangar Sarai Block, District-
Nalanda.
8. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj Dhurgaon, Ekangar Sarai
Block, District- Nalanda.
9. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj Dhurgaon, Ekangar Sarai Block,
District- Nalanda.
10. Kumari Anju, Wife of Shashikant, Resident of Village/ Mohalla and P.O.-
Dhurgaon, P.S.- Ekangarsarai, District- Nalanda.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Pramod Kumar, Adv.
	:	Mr. Ritesh Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Md. Raisul Haque (SC10)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 30-11-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

2. The present writ petition has been filed challenging
the order dated 02.12.2019 passed by the District Magistrate,
Nalanda at Bihar Sharif in Anganwari Case No. 06 of 2018 as
well as order dated 22.01.2013/ 29.01.2013 passed by the
Divisional Commissioner, Patna in Misc. Appeal No. 205 of
2011.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner
has earlier moved before this Hon'ble Court in C.W.J.C. No.



3940 of 2013 which was allowed and matter was remitted back to the Collector to decide the issue in terms of the guidelines given in 2010 Scheme as to whether the Gotni will come under the prohibited area of consideration or she will be entitled for consideration for being appointed as Anganbari Sevika.

4. Counsel for the State submits that the order passed by the Collector, Nalanda is well reasoned order in which the issue decided by the Court in the light of guidelines of 2011 has been discussed and decided and as such, the petitioner's selection was found illegal. The said order was subsequently challenged before the Commissioner and the Commissioner has affirmed the said order.

5. Upon going through the reasons assigned particularly, in the light of Clause 4.6 of Departmental Guideline 2010, this Court is of the view that there is no need of any interference in the decision made by the Collector, Nalanda, Bihar Sharif affirmed by the Commissioner.

6. In this view of the matter, the present writ application is hereby dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Prakashmani/-

U			
---	--	--	--

