

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16956 of 2013

=====

Sarita Kumari Wife Of Sunil Kumar Resident Of Village - Bhane Bigha,
Police Station - Makhdumpur, District - Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya
3. The District Magistrate, Jehanabad
4. The Child Development Officer, Makhdumpur, Jehanabad
5. The District Programme Officer, Jehanabad
6. The Director, I.C.D.S. Directorate, Social Welfare Department, Government Of Bihar, Indira Bhawan,
7. The Secretary, Bihar Sanskrit Shiksha Board, Patna
8. Sudha Kumari Wife Of Arvind Kumar Resident Of Village - Bhane Bigha,
Police Station - Makhdumpur, District - Jehanabad

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Deepika Sharma, AC to SC-9
Mr. Aayush Abhishek AC to SC-9
For Bihar Sanskrit Siksha Board: Mr. S.S. Sundram, Adv.
Mr. Sanjiv Kumar, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 10-01-2023 Heard the parties.

The contention of the petitioner is that Respondent No. 8 has been appointed as Anganwari Sevika at Village-Bhane Bigha in Nagar Panchayat Makhdumpur at Jehanabad on the basis of forged mark-sheet/certificate produced by Respondent No.8.

Learned counsel for the petitioner referred to a letter dated 23.11.2012 (Annexure-4) to this petition issued by Bihar Sanskrit Shiksha Board and submits that the Board did not find



the name of the petitioner as candidate who passed Madhyama Examination having Code No. 64, Roll No. 127 in the year 2000 and accordingly, refused to issue certificate based upon mark-sheet produced by Respondent No. 8.

Learned counsel next submits that a writ application bearing CWJC No. 12764/2013 was filed by the Respondent No. 8 for quashing of letter dated 23.11.2012 which was dismissed by a Bench of this Court *vide* order/judgment dated 29.10.2015. Thereafter, the LPA preferred against the order dated 29.10.2015 also got dismissed.

The petitioner has filed a detailed complaint/representation before Respondent No.5, the District Programme Officer, Jehanabad annexed at Annexure-2 to this petition on 23.08.2012 but no decision upon the same has been taken by Respondent No.5.

In view of the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and taking into consideration the fact that the complaint/representation preferred by the petitioner has not yet been decided by the District Programme Officer, Jehanabad, accordingly, I direct the Respondent No.5, the District Programme Officer, Jehanabad to consider the complaint/representation of the petitioner in accordance with



law and pass a reasoned order after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner as well as Respondent No.8 within a period of three months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

With the above observation and direction, the instant writ petition stands disposed of.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

perwez

U			
---	--	--	--

