

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10084 of 2024

=====

Sangita Devi @ Sangita Gupta, Wife of Vinod Gupta, Resident of ward No. 3,
village Goura, Damki Tola, P.S.- Kataiya, District- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Saran Division, at Chhapra.
4. The District Magistrate, Gopalganj.
5. The District Program Officer (ICDS), Gopalganj.
6. The Child Development Project Officer, Kataiya Gopalganj.
7. Manju Devi @ Manju Kumari, Wife of Shambhu Gupta @ Shambhu Kumar, Resident of Village- Goura, Damki Tola, P.S.- Kataiya, District- gopalganj.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanat Kumar Mishra, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rajesh Kumar, AC to G. P. 3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 04-07-2024 Heard Mr. Sanat Kumar Mishra, learned counsel

 appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Rajesh Kumar,

 learned AC to G.P. 3 for the State.

2. Taking into consideration the fact that the matter has been kept pending since the Year, 2013 and the petitioner claims herself to be eligible for the post of ‘Anganbadi Sewika’ and her name was also there in the selection list, however, the Authority concerned, in a *mala fide* manner, has not appointed the petitioner and the respondent no. 7 (Manju Devi @ Manju Kumari) was appointed as ‘Anganbadi Sewika’, who has less



marks than the petitioner. The respondent no. 7 has been terminated from the post of ‘*Anganbadi Sewika*’ and the post is vacant but the Authorities have not taken any steps to appoint the petitioner on the said post.

3. The petitioner, if so desire, may file a detail representation before the Authority concerned for being considered her appointment on the post of ‘*Anganbadi Sewika*’, taking into consideration the fact that the post has become vacant after the termination of the respondent no. 7.

4. With above observation/direction, the present writ application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

chn/saurabh-

U			
---	--	--	--

