

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14064 of 2021

=====

Savitri Devi, W/o Rampukar Ram, Resident of Village-Lahuria, Laptaha,
Ward 14, P.S.-Parihar, District-Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Pripal Seertary Socile Welfete Project Department, Govt. of Bihar.
2. District Program Officer, Sitamarhi.
3. Child Development Project Officer, Parihar.
4. Lady Supervisor, Anganbari Centre No. 86 Lahuria Laptaha Ward No. 16.
5. Rina Devi, W/o Ram Nirekhan Choudhary, Resident of Village-Lahuria Laptaha, Ward No. 14, Anganbari Centre No. 86, P.S. Parihar, District-Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Krishna Murari, Advocate
For the State : Mr.S. K. Mandal (Sc3)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 13-12-2023

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following relief(s):-

"1. That, certiorari writ application is being filed for setting a side the order dated 09.04.2021 passed in Anganbari Appeal No.24/2019 by the learned Court of Collector Sitamarhi whereby and where under learned court has allow the appeal and set-a-side the order passed in Anganbari Case No.3/20118 vide Memo No.830 dated 02.03.2019 by the District Program Officer Sitamarhi."

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 law laid down by the learned Division Bench of this Court, as aforesaid, 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 disposed off as not pressed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

Saurav/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	14.12.2023
Transmission Date	NA

