

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10637 of 2018

=====

Umi Devi Wife of Raj Kumar, Resident of Village- Dular Bigha, PS- Dev Kund, District- Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya.
2. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad.
3. The District Program Officer, Aurangabad.
4. The Block Development Officer, Goh Block, Aurangabad.
5. The Child Development Project Officer, Goh Block, Aurangabad.
6. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj, Hathiyara, Dular Bigha, Goh, Aurangabad.
7. The Supervisor, Aganbari Center Dular Bigha, Code No-01, Goh, Aurangabad.
8. The Savika, Aganbari Center Dular Bigha, Code No-01, Goh, Aurangabad.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ashok Kumar, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Prashant Pratap (GP-2)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 23-07-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

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

I. For quashing the impugned order issued *vide* Memo No.1793 dated 17.12.2015 in Anganbari Removal Case No.17/2015 passed by the District Programme Officer, Aurangabad.

II. For quashing the order dated 04.08.2017 in



Anganbari Removal Appeal No.02/2016 passed by the District Magistrate, Aurangabad.

3. Learned counsel for the State submits that in both the orders i.e. order passed by the DPO, Aurangabad as well as order passed by the District Magistrate, Aurangabad, it has come on record that the petitioner in her defence has not placed any chit of paper by which it become clear that the petitioner has intimated about her illness to any of the higher authorities either to the women supervisor or to the CDPO or DPO and therefore, a reasoned and speaking order has been passed.

4. Upon perusal of the record, it transpires to this Court that the DPO, Aurangabad and the District Magistrate, Aurangabad has passed a reasoned order in which it is clear that the petitioner was continuously absent consistently for a long period without any information.

5. As such, this Court is of the firm view that there is no need to interfere in the matter and therefore, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

