

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16698 of 2013

ANITA KUMARI W/O Late Sudhir Kumar Jha R/O Vill. - Khanpatti Tola
Bishanpur, Gram Panchayat Bangaon East, P.S. Bangaon, Distt. Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR and ORS
2. The Commissioner, Koshi Division, Saharsa
3. The District Magistrate, Saharsa
4. The District Programme Officer, Saharsa
5. The Child Development Project Officer, Kahra, Saharsa
6. Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat, Bangaon East, P.S. Bangaon, Distt. Saharsa
7. Kiran Kumari W/O Late Hare Ram Choudhary R/O Khanpatti, Panchayat
Bangaon East Tola, Bishanpur, P.S. Bangaon Block Kahra, Distt. Saharsa

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mahendra Pathak, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. A.Ujjwal, Adv.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH
SHARMA**

ORAL ORDER

2 16-01-2023 1. The petitioner had applied for the post of Anganbari worker. While this Court has already held that the post of Anganbari worker being a contractual post under scheme, the writ could not lie for addressing to the grievances relating to the post of Anganbari worker. However, the petitioner in the present case assess the order of the Collector as well as of the Commissioner.

2. This Court finds that the orders passed by the Collector as well as by the Commissioner are in terms of the guidelines issued under the Anganbari Scheme and the power



exercised therein would not be treated as that of Collector but as an Appellant Authority and Divisional Authority.

3. In view of the fact that this Court has held, writ would not lie relating to Anganbari worker, the present writ petition also fails.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the post of Anganbari worker in the particular region was for open category, but the Collector has found on merits that the post was meant for a backward category. After noticing the number of persons in terms of the population relating to the different category, the Commissioner has also upheld the order. No interference is warranted.

5. The writ petition is dismissed accordingly.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

Suraj/-
Item No. 42

U			
---	--	--	--

