

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4973 of 2022

=====

Bimla Devi, Wife of Ramroop Ravi Das, Resident of Village-Channo, P.O.-
Channo, Panchayat-Kurma Ward No. -4, Block-Kahalgaon, PS-Rasalpur
(Ekchari), District-Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare
Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Divisional Commissioner, Bhagalpur Commissioner, Bhagalpur.
3. District Magistrate cum Collector, Bhagalpur.
4. District Education Officer, Bhagalpur.
5. District Programme Officer, Bhagalpur.
6. Child Development Project Officer (CDPO), Kahalgaon.
7. Mahila Parvechika, Selection Committee Member cum Secretary, Anganvari
Sevika - Khoja, Dhanora 4, Pariyojana Kahalgaon, Dist.-Bhagalpur.
8. Rupa Kumari, W/o Praveen Kumar, Village-Changoo, P.S.-Kahalgaon,
District-Bhagalpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Deepak Kumar Sinha, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Prasant Pratap (Gp2)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 23-11-2023

The present writ petition has been filed seeking the
following reliefs:-

*"(i). To quash the order dated 02.08.2021, vide
Misc. Aaganwari revision case no. 46/2020-21,
passed by the Learned Court of commissioner
Divisional Commissioner, Bhagalpur, by which
revision case of petitioner with regard to
appointment of Anganwari Sewika was dismissed
and confirm the order of District Program Officer*



Bhagalpur arises out of order, dated: 04.09.2020 vide miscellaneous (Anganwari case no. 52/ 2019-20) passed by District Programmer Officer. Bhagalpur.

(ii). To further quash the order dated: 04.09.2020 passed by Learned Court of District Programme Officer, Bhagalpur with regard to appointment of petitioner to the post of Anganwari Sewika vide miscellaneous Anganwari case no.52 /2019-20.III.

(ii). To Command and direct the respondents to appoint the petitioner to the post of Anganwari Sewika at centre no. 353 ward no. 4, Khoja Dhanora 4, Kahalgaon, Bhagalpur after quashing aforesaid both the order of commissioner and District programmer officer concern as well as illegal appointment of private respondent no. 8, namely Rupa Kumari."

2. At this juncture, this Court would refer to a judgment rendered by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of ***Seema Kumari vs. The State of Bihar and others***, reported in ***(2015) SCC Online Pat 7267***, paragraphs no. 9 to 11 whereof, are reproduced herein below:-

"9. As noted above, the Anganbari Sevika is not a government servant and has no protection under Article 311(2) of the Constitution of India so as to envisage the concept of regular departmental proceeding. The petitioner was



given a notice. She was informed about the allegation against her. She had filed her show-cause reply which was considered by the District Programme officer and when the order went against her, she had also been given adequate opportunity by the appellate authority who, in fact, had himself got the matter verified by referring the matter to the Bihar Sanskrit Board.

10. In that view of the matter, this Court would not find any error in the impugned order of termination of the services of the petitioner when it is found that the petitioner had got appointment by producing a document in support of qualification which was found to be incorrect/forged.

11. Thus for the reasons indicated above, this application must fail and is, accordingly, dismissed.”

3. It would be apt to refer to yet another judgment rendered by the learned Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***Neetu Kumari v. The State of Bihar and others***, reported in ***2011 (4) PLJR 20***, paragraphs no. 4 and 5 whereof are reproduced herein below:-

“4. In our considered view, the post of Anganbari Sevika is not a post having security



of tenure or protection under Article 311 of Constitution of India. Considering the very nature of engagement which provides of honorarium, we are of the view that in case the appellant still feels aggrieved, she may approach the Civil Court for damages. There is nothing at stake in such a scheme other than honorarium. For such contractual engagements the relief of reinstatement is not appropriate and even if there is breach of the scheme or any other principle of law, the claim should ordinarily be permitted, if found good on merits, only for damages.

5. The appeal is dismissed.”

4. Considering the aforesaid aspect of the matter, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks not to press the present writ petition, however, seeks liberty on behalf of the petitioner to avail such other alternative remedies as are otherwise available under the law. Liberty, so sought, is granted.

5. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

Ajay/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	24.11.2023
Transmission Date	NA

