

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15391 of 2023

=====

Rajani Roy @ Rajni Roy Wife of Yaswant Kuamr Resident of Village-Indarwara West, Ward No.9, P.S.-Halai O.P. Block-Morwa, District-Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secreary, Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, I.C.D.S., Social Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Samastipur.
4. The District Programme Officer (I.C.D.S.), Samastipur.
5. The Child Development project Officer (I.C.D.S.), Morwan, Samastipur.
6. The Lady Supervisor, Morwan, Samastipur.
7. Anshu Kumari Wife of Vikash Kumar Resident of Indarwara West Wards No.9, P.S.-Halai O.P., Block- Morwan, District-Samastipur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Binay Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Prashant Pratap (Gp2)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

2 02-04-2024 1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following relief(s):-

“1(i) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the order dated 05.07.2023 passed by the respondent No.2 in Anganwari Appeal Case No. 223/2019, (Rajani Roy Versus Anshu Kumari and others) whereby and whereunder the respondent No.2 affirmed the order dated 08.03.2019 passed by the District Programme Officer, Samastipur the



respondent No.3 in Case No. 324/2018.

(ii) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the order dated 08.03.2019 passed by the District Programme Officer, Samastipur the respondent No.3 in Case No. 324/2018 whereby and whereunder he removed the petitioner from the post of Anganwari Sewikf of Centre No.212, Ward No.9, Village-Indarwara, West and in her place the private respondent No.6 was appointed/ selected at the said centre.

(iii) For issuance of a direction to the concerned to pay the respondent authority to pay the petitioner with all consequential benefits from the date of termination till the date of her reinstatement for which the petitioner would have been entitled, if her appointment had not been cancelled illegally by the respondent No.3 after cancelling the appointment of the private respondent No.6.”

2. At the outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks not to press the present writ petition, however, seeks liberty on behalf of the petitioner to avail such other alternative remedies as are otherwise available under the law, including that of filing a civil suit before the learned Civil Court having



competent jurisdiction, for redressal of her aforesaid grievances.
Liberty so sought is granted.

3. The writ petition stands dismissed as not pressed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

Saurav/-

U			
---	--	--	--

