

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14653 of 2024

=====

Soni Kumari W/o Santosh Kumar Resident of Village-Lodipur, P.O.-Amaon,
P.S.-Chainpur, District-Kaimur, Bhabhua

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Directorate of Integrated Child Development Scheme, Indira Bhawan, Baily Road, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Kaimur at Bhabhua.
5. The District Program Officer (ICDS), Kaimur, District-Bhabhua
6. The Child Development Project Officer, Chainpur, Kaimur, District-Bhabhua
7. Rita Kumari W/o Dinesh Kumar Bind, Resident of Village-Lodipur, P.O.-Amaon, P.O.-Amaon, P.S.-Chainpur, Kaimur, District-Bhabhua.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Government Pleader (26)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 26-09-2024 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 order dated
08.07.2022 passed in Aanganbari Appeal
Complaint Case No. 13 of 2021 by the District
Programme Officer, ICDS, Kaimur and



consequential revisional order dated 07.05.2024 affirmed by Divisional Commissioner, Patna, passed in ICDS Case No. 245 of 2022 whereby petitioner's candidature for selection as Aanganbari Sevika has not been considered despite she was above in the merit list than the selected candidate.

II. Petitioner further prays for issuance of a writ in the nature of a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ / order / to the respondent authorities to ensure that selection letter be issued strictly in terms of merit list on the basis of Matriculation certificate.

III. For any other relief or reliefs which may the petitioner is entitled in the eye of law.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that both orders by District Programme Officer has been passed illegally and without consideration of the document. Counsel submits that consequent revisional order passed by the Divisional Commissioner, Patna, has also not considered his case. Learned Counsel for the petitioner further submits that two different certificates inserting two different date of birth have been created by her opponents. The petitioner has only



one certificate having one date of birth. Therefore, this order is bad in law.

4. Learned Counsel for the State, on the other hand, opposes the writ petition and submits that it has clearly been acknowledged that the certificate of Matric, Adhar Card and Voter Id Card everywhere the signature of petitioner is there. Therefore, the stand taken by the petitioner that from where those documents came into existence may not be accepted.

5. Upon hearing the parties and perusal of the orders, it transpires to this Court that the reasons have well explained by the Divisional Commissioner, Patna, in its order dated 07.05.2024. As such, this Court is not inclined to interfere in this case. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./-

U			
---	--	--	--

