

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2256 of 2025**

=====

Gulshan Parveen Wife of Md. Aslam, Daughter of Md. Imtiyaz, resident of  
Village- Alapur, Ward No.1, Post- Babhangawan, P.S.- Korma, District-  
Sheikhpura. ... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar,  
Patna.
3. The Director I.C.D.S. Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Commissioner, Munger Commissionery, Munger.
5. The District Magistrate, Sheikhpura.
6. The District Programme Officer, Sheikhpura, District- Sheikhpura.
7. The Child Development Project Officer, Ghat Kusumha, District-  
Sheikhpura.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pratap Sharma, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Prabhat Ranjan, Adv.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      18-02-2025                      Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner has invoked the jurisdiction of this Court seeking a direction upon the respondent concerned to appoint the petitioner on the post of Anganwadi Sevika in Ward No. 1 of Alapur Village, bearing Anganwadi Center No. 41 of Gram Panchayat-Panapur, P.S.- Korma, District-Sheikhpura in the light of State Government decision as contained in notification dated 05.04.2016.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that notwithstanding, the order passed by the Collector, Sheikhpura in Misc. Case No.-163 of 2024 on 19.12.2024, as also, the



petitioner being found successful and suitable candidate, she could not be extended the fruit of the order aforementioned, and thus, the petitioner compelled to move before this Court. It is the contention of the petitioner that after getting the order aforementioned, the petitioner has also filed an application before the concerned authorities to ensure the implementation of the order of the Collector, Sheikhpura, but nothing positively has been done.

4. Learned Advocate for the State vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioner and submitted that invoking the jurisdiction of this Court to execute the order of the District Magistrate, *per se*, wholly misconceived and not at all maintainable.

5. This Court finds substance in the submission advanced on behalf of the learned Advocate for the State. However, this Court thinks it appropriate to observe here that the petitioner has already filed an application before the concerned authorities, hence are obligated to look into the matter and bring to its logical conclusion.

6. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed off.

**(Harish Kumar, J)**

shivank/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

