

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3413 of 2025

=====

Tulsi Kumari Wife of Munilal Ram, Resident of Village- Cheria Bariyarpur,
P.O.- Siripur, P.S.- Cheria Bariyarpur, District- Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Director, I.C.D.S, Directorate Social Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. D.M., Begusarai.
4. District Programme Officer, Begusarai.
5. Child Development Project Officer, Cheria Bariyarpur, Begusarai.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjiv Kumar, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Mahtab Alam, AC to SC-20

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

2 27-02-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking a direction upon the respondent authorities to appoint her on the vacant post of Anganbari Sevika in Ward No. 4 of Cheria Bariyarpur Panchayat, in terms of her merit position in the merit list prepared by the duly constituted selection committee and also to extend all the benefits.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner fairly contended that pursuant to the advertisement published in the year 2019 by the office of the Child Development Project Directorate, Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, a selection was duly conducted for the post of Anganbari Sevika



in different Anganbari Centre including Ward No. 4 of Cheria Bariyarpur Panchayat. It is the contention of the petitioner that merit list was duly prepared and one Pramila Bharti secured first position, whereas the petitioner was at serial no. 3 of the merit list. Since the candidate, who secured second position in the merit list belongs to EBC category and, therefore, the Pramila Bharti, who secured first position was duly selected. Despite the complaint made by the petitioner with regard to certain irregularities in the selection, no action was taken. Now the petitioner came to know that the said Pramila Bharti, who was selected as Anganbari Sevika has also tendered her resignation and thus, the post of Anganbari Sevika became vacant and hence, a prayer has been made to appoint her on the vacant post in terms of the merit position.

4. Learned Advocate for the State, at the outset, submits that since the entire selection has already been completed way back in the year 2019 itself and it has not been disclosed as to when the successful appointed candidate Pramila Bharti has tendered her resignation, it is very difficult to respond to the submission of the petitioner.

5. Considering the submissions advanced on behalf of the learned Advocate for the petitioner and taking note of the



fact that the life of the panel of the selected candidate is meant only for a year, in terms of Clause-9 of the Guidelines, 2019, this Court does not find any reason and occasion to entertain the writ petition.

6. Suffice it to observe that if fresh selection shall be processed, the petitioner shall always be at liberty to participate in the selection.

7. The writ petition stands closed with the liberty aforesaid.

(Harish Kumar, J)

shivank/-

U			
---	--	--	--

