

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16153 of 2018

=====

Kumari Renu Sharma Wife of Sri Mukesh Kumar, Resident of VillagePost-
Sabhari, P.S.- Nardiganj, District- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The District Magistrate, District Collectariat, Nawada, District- Nawada.
3. The District Programme Officer, ICDS Office, District- Nawada.
4. The Child Development Project Officer, Block- Nardiganj, District- Nawada.
5. The Panchayat Sachiv, Panchayat-Gram Panchayat Parma, Block- Nardiganj, District- Nawada.
6. The Mukhiya, Panchayat- Gram Panchayat Parma, Block- Nardiganj, District- Nawada.
7. The Members, Aaganwari Sevika Selection Committee, Panchayat-Gram Panchayat Parma, Block- Nardiganj
8. Soni Kumari, Wife of Sri Sanjeev Kumar, Resident of VillagePost- Sabhari, P.S.- Nardiganj, District- Nawada.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jayram Sharma, Adv
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Md. Raisul Haque- SC-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 02-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing of the order dated 05.06.2018 contained in Memo No. 359(PB) dated 08.06.2018 (Annexure-9) passed by the learned District Magistrate, Nawada bearing Case No. 222(M) of 2016 as well as order dated 10.08.2016 contained Memo No. 591 dated 10.08.2016 (Annexure-8) passed by the District



Programme Officer, Nawada bearing case No. 31(Misc.)
Selection of the year 2016.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the only grievance of the petitioner is that no fresh selection shall be made and the case of the petitioner shall be considered on the basis of all the documents already filed by the petitioner in the earlier selection process.

4. Learned counsel for the State submits that the case of the petitioner cannot be considered due to the reason that appointment of Anganwari Sevika and Sahaiyka took place in the year 2010 and objection has been filed after the delay of approx six years. As such, appointment of the petitioner could not be considered on the basis of documents and it is due to this reason, the order of the District Magistrate, Nawada has been passed completely, in accordance with law. If the petitioner is interested to be appointed as Anganwari Sevika and Sahaiyka, she may appear in the fresh appointment process.

5. Counsel for the petitioner relied on the judgment of this Court in case of *Minita Kumari @ Minita Devi Vs. the State of Bihar and Ors* in which vide order dated 28.01.2011 in C.W.J.C. No. 7184 of 2010, it was directed that appointment process shall be made on the basis earlier documents filed by



the petitioner.

6. Upon hearing the parties, it transpires to this Court that in the present case, petitioner has challenged the appointment of private respondent no. 8 after the delay of approx six years and on this ground the case of the petitioner shall not be considered by virtue of earlier documents filed and therefore, direction for appointment of Anganwari Sevika and Sahaiyka by fresh advertisement passed by the District Magistrate needs no interference.

7. Considering the aforesaid observation, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Sunnykr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

