

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4879 of 2018

=====

Manti Devi Wife of Sheo Kumar Ram Resident of Village-Srirampur, P.S.-
Parsa, District-Saran Chapara.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Commissioner, Social Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna. null null
3. The Commissioner, Saran Chhapra. null null
4. The District Magistrate District Saran Chhapra. null null
5. The Deputy Development Commissioner Saran Chhapra.
6. The District Panchayat Raj Officer Saran Chhapra.
7. The District Programme Officer, Saran.
8. The Block Development Officer, Parsa.
9. The Child Development Planninag Officer Block-Parsa.
10. Shree Ram Bichar Singh Earlier Mukhiya Village Panchayar-Saguni Block-Parsa, Dist.-Saran.
11. Sita devi Wife of Sanjay Kumar Srivastava (Out if Poshak Area) Resident of Village-Srirampur Police Station-Parsa, Post Office-Parsa, District-Saran Chhapra.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Surendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha, GA 7

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 25-09-2023 Heard the parties.

*2. The present petition has been preferred for
the issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus for set
aside/void/stay illegal termination order 29/05/2015
passed by District Program Officer, Saran along with
order dated 07/07/2017 passed by District Officer, Saran
in Aaganwadi Appeal Case No. 06/2015. As stay of*



Termination order 29/05/2015 (Manti Devi versus District Program Officer and others) passed by Dy. Director welfare Saran (Chapra) Conspiracy stand after eleven years joining as post of Sevika from prepared to conspiracy in earlier selection record by office staff with help to husband's Gita Devi as namely, Sanjay Kumar Srivastva as petitioner's name change (Manti Kumari replace Manti Devi), on selection merit list chart column qualification (Non-matric replace Matric), prepared by office staff along with as selection letter real name Malti Kumar replace wrongly Manti Devi replace Malti Devi allies Manti Devi wife of Shiv Kumar Ram. As writ C.W.J.C. No. 12065 of 2011 wrongly name entry Malti Devi by petitioner as namely Gita Devi wife of Sanjay Kumar Srivastva. When petitioners submit real certificate prove real name Manti Kumari qualification Non-Matric name of Manti Kumari as Mark sheet, Transfer certificate and issue by Headmaster of Mahendra Balika High School, Esmilchak, Sonpur signature with Headmaster and stamp because Sevika Manti Kumari and Husband Shiv Kumar Ram has no qualified persons. So has been misguide by office staff from period of selection since



30/12/2003 as always system by office staff authority with side for cross or harass illegal Sanjay Kumar Srivastva as Gita Devi husband as Respondent Nos. 11,7,8,9 & 4.

3. The District Programme Officer, Saran at Chapra has passed a reasoned order after putting the petitioner on notice and quoting the guidelines and only after he came to the conclusion that since Gita Devi was having the requisite qualification, she should have been extended the selection letter instead of the petitioner. Accordingly, the selection letter granted to the petitioner was set aside.

4. Aggrieved, the petitioner moved before the District Magistrate, Saran at Chapra in Anganwari Appeal Case No. 06 of 2015 which was heard and an order was passed on 07.07.2017 and after having gone through the facts of the case and the submissions of the parties, the District Magistrate came to the conclusion that the petitioner is eighth pass, do not have even the basic educational criteria to get the said selection letter which was done only with the help of the then Circle Officer cum Child Development Project Officer, Parsa who recorded in the proceeding that she is a matric pass.

5. This Court has gone through the orders of the District Programme Officer, Saran at Chapra as also the District



Magistrate, Saran at Chapra and from the facts it is clear that due to local connivance, the petitioner got the selection letter and after hearing the parties, the respondents came to the right conclusion that she does not deserve the same.

6. No merit in the writ petition and is accordingly dismissed.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Neha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

