

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 2800 of 2020**

SAVINA KHATUN wife of Atiqur Rahman, Resident of Village- Khetapur,  
Post Office- Manikpur, Ward No. 5, Police Station- Sarairanja, District-  
Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department,  
Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Commissioner, Darbhanga Division, Darbhanga
3. The Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme (I.C.D.S.), Bihar, Patna
4. The District Magistrate, Samastipur
5. The District Programme Officer, Integrated Child Development Scheme  
(I.C.D.S.), Samastipur, District- Samastipur
6. The Block Development Officer, Sarairanja, District- Samastipur
7. The Child Development Project Officer, Sarairanja Block, District-  
Samastipur
8. The Lady Supervisor, Sarairanja, District- Samastipur
9. Shahnaz Parveen, wife of Md. Sagir Alam, resident of Village- Manika  
Bighanpur, Post Office- Akhtiyarpur, Ward No. 5, Police Station-  
Sarairanja, District- Samastipur

... .. Respondent/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : N O N E  
For the Respondent/s : Ms Kumari Amrita, GP III

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**

**ORAL ORDER**

**2      14-09-2023**                      No one appears for the petitioner though Ms Kumari  
Amrita, learned GP III is present.

2 Prayer is for the following reliefs:

***“That the petitioner craves  
indulgence of this Hon’ble Court for  
issuance of an appropriate writ in the  
nature of certiorari for setting aside the  
order dated 22.02.2019 vide Memo No  
653 dated 23.02.2019 as contained in  
impugned order whereby and where  
under respondent No 5 illegally selected***



***respondent No 9 on the post of Anganbari Sevika at Anganbari Centre No 281 under Sarairanjan Block, District – Samastipur and further for directing the respondents to appoint petitioner on the post of Anganbari Sevika at Anganbari Centre No 281 because the petitioner is the most competent candidate.”***

3 At the outset, it has been pointed by learned GP III that the lady has not approached the authorities envisaged under the Guidelines for the redressal of her grievance. She has taken this Court to paragraph 16 of the counter affidavit of respondents No 5 and 7 to show that the petitioner ought to have approached the District Collector by filing appeal.

4 Although, in absence of learned counsel for the petitioner, the case should have been dismissed for non-prosecution, but in view of the fact that the petitioner has not approached the Collector, liberty is granted to the petitioner, if she so wants, to move before the Collector, Samastipur in appeal.

5 The writ petition is disposed of with the aforesaid liberty.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

**M.E.H./-**

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

