

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17740 of 2015**

Manju Devi Wife of Sri Rajesh Kumar Jha Resident of village - Bare, P.S.  
Bihra, District - Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Secretary, Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, Social Welfare, Social Welfare Directorate, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. The District Magistrate, Saharsa
5. The District Welfare Officer, Saharsa
6. District Programme officer, Saharsa
7. Child Development Programme officer C.D.P.O. , Satar Katya Block, District Saharsa
8. Mukhiya, Bare Gram Panchayat, District - Saharsa

... .. Respondent/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satish Chandra Jha-3, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ashok Priyadarshi, GA 4

**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 Anganwadi Worker.

2. In **C.W.J.C. No. 21963 of 2014** decided on **12.12.2022 (Reena Kumari Vs. State of Bihar & Ors.,)** this Court has held that the post of Anganwadi Worker does not fall within the purview of State or Subordinate Services. The post of Anganwadi 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 Anganwadi 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 Anganwadi 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)**

Suraj/-  
Item No. 69

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

