

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12703 of 2021**

=====

Bibi Rumi Anjum W/o- Md. Musahid Resident of Ward no. 03, Village-  
Karbola, Gram Panchayat- Sisauna, P.S.- Jokihat, Dist- Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department,  
Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner, Purnea Division, Purnea.
4. The District Magistrate, Araria.
5. The District Programme Officer, Araria.
6. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Araria.
7. The Block Development Officer, Jokihat.
8. The Child Development Project Officer, Jokihat.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Siyaram Pandey, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Md. Raisul Haque (Sc10)

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      30-11-2023              The present writ petition has been filed seeking the  
following relief:-

“1. That this is an application for issuance of a writ in the nature of writ of mandamus or an appropriate writ/writs/,order/orders or direction/directions commanding the respondents to appoint the petitioner forthwith on the basis of the advertisement published in the year 1918, a merit list was published in which the selection of first and second applicant were held illegal by the respondent no.5 and the selection and appointment of the petitioner was held lawful, as



per law and valid but a direction was given to the respondent no.7 to initiate the selection procedure afresh which is unnecessary time taking, not just proper and lawful rather it is causing loss/harassment to the petitioner who has been a genuine and bonafide candidate, top in the merit list, and so she is legally entitled for her appointment on the basis of the advertisement of the year 2018 forthwith not by the fresh advertisement and fresh selection process which has already been completed and/or be pleased to pass such other order or orders which may be deemed fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of case.”

2. After some arguments, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks not to press the present writ petition, however, seeks liberty on behalf of the petitioner to approach the Respondents authorities for redressal of her aforesaid grievances. Liberty, so sought, is granted.

3. The present writ petition stands disposed off as not pressed.

**(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)**

Ajay/-

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

