

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1512 of 2024

=====

Bibi Runi Anjum W/o Md. Musahid, R/o Ward No. 03, Village-Karbola,
Gram Panchayat-Sisauna, P.S. Jokihat, Dist-Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner, Purnea Division, Purnea.
4. The District Magistrate, Araria.
5. The District Programme Officer, Araria.
6. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Araria.
7. The Block Development Officer, Jokihat.
8. The Child Development Project Officer, Jokihat.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Siyaram Pandey, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Government Pleader 26

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

2 29-02-2024 The present writ petition has been filed
seeking the following relief:-

"1. That this is an application for issuance of a writ in the nature of writ of Certiorari for quashing/setting aside order dated. 25.08.2023 passed in Aangabari Revision No. 18/2021 as well as for quashing/setting aside Aanganbari Appeal No. 22/2023 vide order dated-13.10.2023 passed by the court of commissioner, Purnea who have not perused the order passed by the District Programme



Officer, Araria in Aanganbari Appeal case No. 43/2018-19 in a very wrong, arbitrary and biased manner and/or be pleased to pass a writ in the nature of writ of mandamus or an appropriate writ/writs, order/orders or direction/directions commanding the respondents to appoint the petitioner on the post of Aanganwari Sewika forthwith on the basis of advertisement published in the year 2018, a merit list was published in which the selection of first and second applicant were held illegal by the respondent no. 5 and the selection and appointment of the petitioner was held lawful, as per law and valid but a direction was given to the respondent no.7 to initiate the selection procedure afresh which is not just and lawful rather it is time taking causing loss to the petitioner who is a genuine and bonafide candidate top in the merit list and so she is legally entitled for her appointment on the basis of the then advertisement of the year 2018 forthwith not by the fresh advertisement and selection process which has already been completed."

2. At the outset, 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, including that of filing a civil suit before the learned civil court of competent jurisdiction. Liberty, so sought, is granted.

3. The writ petition stands dismissed as not pressed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

kanchan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

