

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 9704 of 2015**

=====

Meena Kumari W/o Shiv Kumar Yadav, resident of village- Sarojabela, P.O.- Belha, P.S.-  
Marauna, District- Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare,  
Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, I.C.D.S. Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Supaul.
4. The District Programme Officer, Supaul.
5. The Child Development Project Officer, Marauna, District- Supaul.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                              |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Prem Sheela Pandey, Adv. |
| For the Respondent/s | : | Mr. K.K. Jha- AAG14          |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH  
SHARMA**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date : 30-01-2023**

1. In this writ petition grievance raised is relating to  
appointment of Anganwari Worker.

2. In **CWJC No. 21963 of 2014** decided on **12.12.2022**  
**(Reena Kumari Vs. State of Bihar & Ors.,)** this Court has held that  
the post of Anganwari Worker does not fall within the purview of  
State or Subordinate Services. The post of Anganwari Worker is  
under a scheme introduced by Govt. of India and respective State  
Govts. and regulated by guidelines which are non-statutory and  
therefore not enforceable in law. The appointment is on honorarium  
basis and no statutory procedure has been laid down.

3. Of course, under the guidelines, grievance against  
appointment of Anganwari Worker can be raised before the Collector



of concerned District with a further revision to the Commissioner.

4. Even the orders passed by the Collector or the Commissioner would not be a subject matter of judicial review as the power being exercised by them relating to a dispute of Anganwari Worker is under guidelines and they do not act as a statutory authority while deciding such dispute. In view thereof, the writ petition would not be maintainable even against the orders of the Collector or the Commissioner.

5. Leaving it open to the respective writ petition to avail any of the aforesaid remedies, if they have not so availed, the writ petition is held to be not maintainable.

6. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed with the aforesaid liberty.

7. If an appeal/revision is filed, the same shall be decided expeditiously within a period of six months and the question of limitation will not arise.

**(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)**

Lata/-  
Item No.10

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| AFR/NAFR          |  |
| CAV DATE          |  |
| Uploading Date    |  |
| Transmission Date |  |

