

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16694 of 2014

=====

Renu Kumari wife of Shri Prabhu Narayan Sah, Village- Madhu Chapara,
Post- Jamua, P.S.- Bairania, District- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Social and Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, I.C.D.S., Social and Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna
4. The Deputy Director, Welfare, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur
5. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi
6. The District Programme Officer, Sitamarhi
7. The Child Development Project Officer, Bairania, District- Sitamarhi
8. Mahendra Sahani son of Late Saguni Sahani, Ex- Mukhiya of Gram Panchayat- Jamua, resident of village- Madhu Chapara, Post- Jamua, P.S.- Bairania, District- Sitamarhi

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Arun Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Ms Anuradha Singh, SC-21
		Mr. Rakesh Prabhat, AC to SC21
		Ms Bandana Singh, AC to SC-21

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

- 2 20-07-2023 1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:-

“(i) For quashing of the order dated 16.07.2014 passed in Case No.33/2014 contained in letter bearing no.1155 dated 16.07.2014 (annexure-2) of the District Program Officer, Sitamarhi, whereby and whereunder the selection of the petitioner made as Anganwari Sevika has been cancelled upon the charge of selection made



on the basis of forged educational certificate.

(ii) For issuance of a direction to the respondents to pay the honorarium of the petitioner of the working period i.e. March, 2013 to July, 2014.”

2. At the outset, the learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that the appeal, filed by the petitioner against the impugned order dated 16.07.2014, passed by the District Programme Officer, Sitamarhi, in Case No.33 of 2014, cancelling the appointment of the petitioner as Anganwari Sevika, has already stood dismissed during the interregnum period, hence nothing survives for consideration in the present writ petition.

3. In view of the aforesaid, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks liberty on behalf of the petitioner to challenge the order passed by the appellate authority, by taking recourse to such remedies, as are otherwise available under the law. Liberty so sought is granted.

4. The writ petition stands disposed off as not pressed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

kanchan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

