

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5190 of 2020

=====

Shipra Singh @ Rinki Devi Wife of Sri Raj Kumar Singh Resident of Village
and P.O.-Baiju Barhoga, Police-Station-Basantpur, District-Siwan.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare
Department Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Commissioner Saran at Chapra.
3. The District Magistrate Siwan.
4. The District Programme Officer, District-Siwan.
5. The District Welfare Officer, District-Siwan.
6. The Block Bal Development Programme Officer Basantpur, District-Siwan.
7. The Block Development Officer Basantpur, District-Siwan.
8. The Panchayat Secretary Gram Panchayat Raj-Baiju Barhoga, Post-office-
Baiju Barhoga, Block-Basantpur, District-Siwan.
9. Nutan Devi Wife of Jai Prakash Singh Resident of Vilalge-Baiju Barhoga,
Post-Office-Baiju Barhoga, Block-Basantpur, District-Siwan.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shambhu Prasad Yadav, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Md.Raisul Haque (SC-10)
For the respondent no.9 : Mr. Sumesh Kumar, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN

ORAL ORDER

2 20-04-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the State and learned counsel for the respondent
no.9.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for
quashing the appointment of respondent no.9 as well as the
order dated 17.09.2019 passed in Anganbari Appeal Case
No.44/2018-19 (annexed as Annexure-1) by which the order



dated 27.06.2018 passed in Anganbari Miscellaneous Case No.15/17-18 has been confirmed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the said order has not been passed in accordance with law as the name of the petitioner has been added in the voter list of Ward No.13 due to mistake and only due to this reason, the said order has been passed.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent no.9 submits that the order has been passed as per the existing fact and the things which ought to be done not been done in that case. He further submits that order has to be passed on the existing facts of a particular case.

5. Learned counsel for the State specifically submits that in the order of District Magistrate, Siwan the plea of the petitioner has been taken into consideration and thereafter, a reasoned order has been passed.

6. In the light of the submissions made, it transpires to this Court that in the operative portion of the District Magistrate, Siwan it has been categorically stated that the petitioner has not corrected his name which ought to be corrected by him.

7. In this view of the matter, this Court is not inclined



to interfere in the order and accordingly, this writ petition is
hereby dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Divyansh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

