

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4841 of 2018**

=====

Kumari Archana @ Archana Devi W/o Kunj Bihari, Resident of Village-  
Chakhani, Sitapati, Ward No.15, P.S.- Vijaipur, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Gopalganj.
3. The Child Development Programme Officer, Vijaipur, Gopalganj.
4. The District Programme Officer, Gopalganj.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : None.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Prashant Pratap, GP 2

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      25-09-2023                      On call, no one appears on behalf of the petitioner  
although the State is present.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the  
following reliefs:-

*(i) for issuance of appropriate Writ in the  
nature of Mandamus directing the Respondent authorities  
specially respondent no. 3 to considered the application  
of the petitioner for appointment of Aaganbari Sewika,  
whereas petitioner who is resident of village- Chakhani,  
which is Ward no. 15 but due to fault of Bihar Election*



*Office the village Chakhani the name of petitioner and some of their family member has been mentioned in Ward no. 11 in the Panchayat voter list whereas petitioner is resident of Ward no.15 and petitioner candidature was rejected only on sole ground that petitioner is not resident of Ward no. 15 (Village- Chakhani);*

*(ii) for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to consider the claim of the petitioner in the light of letter bearing Letter no. 73 dated 11.01.2017 issued by District Program Officer, Gopalganj, whereby and where under District Program Officer has intimated Respondent no.3 to considered and verify the claim of the petitioner and considered the application of petitioner for appointment before Aam Sabha.*

3. From the different paragraph itself, the petitioner has conceded that due to the lapse on the part of the Election Office, her name was mentioned in Ward No. 11 instead of Ward No. 15 for which the selection process was done.

4. Learned State Counsel has drawn this Court's attention to paragraph 7 in the light of the aforesaid facts that she is not the resident of Ward No. 15 rather of Ward No. 11.



5. However, since there is no representation, the writ  
petition stands dismissed for non prosecution.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

Neha/-

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

